DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 281   CE 050 784

AUTHOR	Schill, William J.; And Others
TITLE	Five Transition Policy Studies Including Pertinent Literature Synthesis. Project TROPHY. Transition Research on Problems of Handicapped Youth.
INSTITUTION	Washington Univ., Seattle. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	May 88
CONTRACT	300-85-0174
NOTE	120p.; For related documents, see CE 050 783-785.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Career Education; *Disabilities; *Educational Policy; *Education Work Relationship; Individualized Education Programs; Job Development; *Job Placement; Literature Reviews; Needs Assessment; *Personnel Policy; Policy Formation; Secondary Education; Work Experience Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Individual Transition Plans

ABSTRACT

The first of five studies in this monograph, "Transition Policies for Youth with Disabilities: Now a Question of Implementation" (Joseph Stowitschek), presents results of a study to determine priority areas for policy analysis among the issues identified in the literature on the school-to-work transition of individuals with disabilities. "Transitional Planning Methods and Progress: A National Study" (Stowitschhek, David Brown) describes a study to provide a base of information on formal transition plans of state agencies responsible for educational, transitional, and adult services for handicapped persons. "Are We in Danger of Making the Same Mistakes with ITPs as Were Made with IEPs?" (Stowitschek, Cheryl Kelso) examines the problems of individual education plan (IEP) use, compares it to the developing use of individual transition plans (ITPs), and recommends policy and procedural changes and research directions. "Washington Job Development Strategies Survey" (Robert Williams; Stowitschek) describes a survey of directors and job developers of rehabilitation programs to obtain information regarding perceptions and practices in their efforts to place developmentally disabled people in supported work situations. "Administrator's Perceptions of Early Work Experiences for Youth with Mild Disabilities" (Stowitschek) describes a preliminary inquiry into administrative and personnel conditions that could influence the enhancement of work experiences. (Fifty-two references are listed.) (YLB)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED298281

FIVE TRANSITION POLICY STUDIES
INCLUDING
PERTINENT LITERATURE SYNTHESIS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

TROPHY

TRANSITION RESEARCH ON PROBLEMS OF HANDICAPPED YOUTH

EC 205 474

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON   COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

TRANSITION RESEARCH ON PROBLEMS OF HANDICAPPED YOUTH

Contract Number 300-85-0174 RFP 85-107

William J. Schill, Principal Investigator

FIVE TRANSITION POLICY STUDIES
INCLUDING
PERTINENT LITERATURE SYNTHESIS

May 1988

Transition Research on Problems
of Handicapped Youth
University of Washington
300 Miller Hall, DQ-12
Seattle, Washington 98195
(206) 543-6253

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TRANSITION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES AND RESEARCH

Table of Contents

Page

TRANSITION POLICIES FOR YOUTH WITH DISABILITIES: NOW A QUESTION OF IMPLEMENTATION
Joseph J. Stowitschek 1

TRANSITION PLANNING METHODS AND PROGRESS: A NATIONAL STUDY
Joseph J. Stowitschek and David Brown 16

ARE WE IN DANGER OF MAKING THE SAME MISTAKES WITH ITPs AS WERE MADE WITH IEPs?
Joseph J. Stowitschek and Cheryl Kelso 41

WASHINGTON JOB DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES SURVEY
Robert Williams and Joseph J. Stowitschek 58

ADMINISTRATOR'S PERCEPTIONS OF EARLY WORK EXPERIENCES FOR YOUTH WITH MILD DISABILITIES
Joseph J. Stowitschek 85

FOREWARD

The papers contained herein resulted from the research activities of the TROPHY staff. Additional copies are available in either printed form or on floppy discs from the address below.

The activities which led to the formulation of these papers were supported in part by the U.S. Department of Education (Contract 300-85-0174). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education and no official endorsements by the Department should be inferred.

William John Schill
Principal Investigator
Project TROPHY
300 Miller Hall, DQ-12
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

TRANSITION POLICIES FOR YOUTH WITH DISABILITIES: NOW A QUESTION OF IMPLEMENTATION

Joseph J. Stowitschek

INTRODUCTION

In its cyclical pattern, the development of vocational skills and alternatives for handicapped youth is again a major emphasis of state and local programs. The federal initiatives behind this emphasis have been identified (Will, 1985) as having five major goals: (1) to help schools provide integrative services responsive to employment-related needs; (2) the improvement of employment opportunities; (3) support and improvement of programs providing for transition without special services; (4) improvement of time-limited services that facilitate transition to employment, and (5) development of new programs that offer on-going services in work settings. Federal research, model development and aid to states programs have been developed to facilitate the attainment of these goals. Although this program cuts across at least three major federal agencies (special education, rehabilitation, developmental disabilities), there is a recognized concern that the cyclical nature of priorities with handicapped persons could result in an effort span that falls short of that which is needed to produce long-lasting effects. It appears that effective programming must have the opportunity to be "institutionalized" in order to ensure long-term benefits (Benz & Halpern, 1987; Johnson, Bruininks, & Thurlow, 1987). Toward this end, the analysis and study of transition policy development and implementation has become increasingly stressed.

Policy development and its subsequent implementation seem to provide the bridge to achieve routine use of innovative practices. Whether viewed from the perspectives of intended outcomes, or de facto actions, study of the processes of policy adoption and implementation holds considerable promise for increasing the impact of current transition efforts. Numerous definitions of policy have been suggested by authoritative sources (Braddock, 1987). Policy decisions are defined by Dunn (1981) as "to exercise reasoned judgment in finding solutions for practical problems" (p. 17). Important features of policy as it relates to educational endeavors have been divided into two main categories by Seekins and Fawcett (1986), legislative and bureaucratic. Seekins and Fawcett have focused on legislative policy change issues and have identified (a) agenda formulation, (b) policy adoption, (c) policy implementation, and (d) policy review as critical steps. Their approach is behavior analytic, following from the exchange theories of political science which define law and public policy as "a statement of a contingency of reinforcement maintained by the government" (p. 36). Those who are governed differentially reinforce law-making and government officials receive their support by making and enforcing laws producing consequences desirable to their supporters. Although applied here in reference to legislative policy making, similar contingencies may determine how policy is interpreted and enacted at the bureaucratic level.

Going beyond this binary split, Guba (1984) typified several levels of policy, each of which has implications for the study of transition policy development. One policy level is expressed as intentions. It may include, (a) "assertions of intent or goals" (Guba, 1984, p. 66), (b) agencies' decisions which specify services, or regulate or control activities, or (c) guidelines pertaining to discretionary actions of agencies. On a second level, policy that is articulated into actions may include formally sanctioned behavior, norms or standards for conduct, or the effect of an agency's operations. Finally, from a consumer standpoint, policy may be expressed as what happens to them.

There is a growing interest in exploring local transition policies and methods of implementation. Cox and her associates (Cox et al., 1984) conducted an analysis of multiple service agencies in each of nine school districts. Local exemplary transition services were the foci of another policy related study (Ballantyne et al., 1985). Information from such research has demonstrated the prospects for outstanding success in transitioning youth and young adults into employment. It has also indicated that gross discrepancies exist in services as compared to state-of-the-art vocational programming. The striking feature of this early work is the degree of variation from one local service program to the next and one state to the next in the development and implementation of transition policy. Interpretations of these results reveal consistencies across reports on some major policy issues, problems, and approaches to implementation. Experts in the field consistently identify the following needs: (a) greater inter-agency cooperation, (b) transition planning, (c) parent involvement, (d) employment incentives, and (e) community-based support and follow-up. Many inconsistencies of opinion regarding which issues are of greatest priority are also evident. Although some issues have been identified based on data, many are based more on conjecture or at best, on personal experience. Thus, a major aim of policy studies should be to determine priorities among the array of issues and then to define the study parameters of these prioritized issues.

EXPERT APPRAISAL OF TRANSITION POLICY ISSUES.

As an initial step in our studies of transition policies, staff of the Transition Research Institute conducted a preliminary investigation in which we sought to determine priority areas for policy analysis among the issues identified across the body of literature on school-to-work and employment transition of individuals with disabilities. The question of interest was, which policy issues would be rated highly by both researchers and program administrators as to their relevance to policy and the need for research?

SAMPLE. Lists of names of directors of federally funded employment transition research and demonstration projects and articles in professional journals provided the sources of potential respondents from the transition research and development (R & D) specialists. A Washington state directory of administrators of agencies providing educational or rehabilitation services or advocating for transition services for handicapped individuals provided a source of practitioner respondents. Thirty potential respondents were selected on the basis of (a) geographic location (no more than two R & D respondents per state), (b) agency representation (one per state agency or association), and (c) willingness to either participate or appoint a representative.

INSTRUMENTATION. An expert appraisal instrument was developed consisting of (a) lists of transition policy statements, (b) instructions for rating the statements as to their relevance as policy issues and the need for further research on them, (c) instructions for identifying the 10 most important issues, (d) space for modifying or commenting on the statements, and (e) space for contributing additional transition policy issue statements or questions. The development process began with a survey of the literature pertaining to the transition of handicapped persons into employment and adult life. A list of 137 transition-related issues and problems was developed from issues drawn from the literature pertaining to transition policy and was edited for brevity and clarity. Similar statements were combined and statements containing two or more distinct issues were divided into separate items. Items that were considered to be too ambiguous or vague were deleted. The lists were compared to those included in other reports for inclusiveness as well as distinctiveness (cf. Illinois Transition Institute booklets).

A draft version of the expert appraisal instrument was prepared and policy team staff completed it as they would request respondents to complete it. The instrument was revised and submitted to senior staff of the Transition Research Institute to be completed and critiqued. The instrument was also critiqued by staff of the Region X Rehabilitation Services Administration. Several items were either added, deleted, or changed. The resulting policy appraisal instrument consisted of 12 categories of policy issues related to transition and a total of 82 items. Figure 1 contains an example of an item and corresponding rating scales. The categories were as follows:

(1) Service agency design, mission or orientation.

(2) Interagency cooperation.

(3) Service program content and procedure.

(4) Laws and regulations.

(5) Evaluation and reporting.

(6) Personnel preparation.

(7) Research/knowledge.

(8) Funding/financing/cost analysis.

(9) Indirect and direct incentives and disincentives.

(10) Parent/family support.

(11) Business/employer-related.

(12) General goals and needs.

Figure 1

Sample Item From The Expert Appraisal Questionnaire

3.12 How can early work experience or employment for students with handicapping conditions be increased and used as community-based training by high school special educators?

Relation to Policy	Need for Research
0 1 2 3 4 N/A	0 1 2 3 4 N/A

Comments:____

____

PROCEDURE. Potential respondents were first contacted by telephone. Those who agreed to participate were mailed copies of the instrument. After three weeks, follow-up telephone calls were made to encourage participation.

RESULTS. Copies of the transition policy expert appraisal were returned over a six-week period. Twenty-three appraisal instruments were returned (77%). Respondents contacted by telephone reported that the appraisal required between two and one half and four hours to complete. One respondent made comments without completing the ratings.

The results are summarized according to: (a) overall ratings of policy issues, (b) the highest rated issues by research and developers, (c) the highest rated issues by practitioners, (d) the 12 issues identified as most important, and (e) written comments.

Respondents' ratings, grouped by issue category, of the extent to which an issue was policy-related and the need for research are summarized in Table 1 (Scale: 0 = Low, 4 = High). Mean overall ratings (policy and need combined), rank orders of the ratings within categories, and overall rank orders for each issue are displayed. Mean ratings ranged between 1.33 for Guidelines for

Appropriate Transition Services, and 3.50 on Balance of Employment Incentives. Individual ratings ranged from zero to four on both policy-related and need for research measures. Although the highest one-third of the ratings (scores above 2.75) were spread across all categories, there were some areas in which high ratings tended to cluster.

Issues pertaining to employer policies and employment incentives and disincentives (e.g., Employers' Incentives and Long-Term Employment, Balance of Employment Incentives, Misinterpretation of SSI & SSDI Regulations, Lack of Job Security, Employers' Personnel Problems, Employers' Hiring Policies, Sheltered Workshops "Catch-22" Situation: best placement prospects are the best contract workers) were rated relatively highly. Another area receiving high ratings pertained to transition planning and service development (e.g., State Transition Plans, Gaps in Transition Services, Cooperative Employment/Independent Living Programs, OSER's Transition Goals, Rural V. Urban Transition Services). A third area receiving high ratings pertained to school policies that fostered or hindered transition (e.g., Functional High School Curriculum, High School Graduation Requirements, Youth's Preclusion from Services, Need for Increased School Follow-up, Use of Vocational Education Set-Aside Money, Post-Secondary Vocational Preparation, Early Work Experience, High School On-the-Job Training, and High School Curriculum Adjustments). Other items receiving high ratings included the need to Improve the Relevance of Assessments to Employment Outcomes, the need to Assess the Impact of Vocational Rehabilitation's Case Closure Policies, the Cost-effectiveness of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the need to increase Parent Involvement in Transition.

The 20 policy issues most highly rated by research and developers are displayed in Table 2. Their responses accounted largely for the area of incentives and disincentives receiving high ratings. Items rated highly by R & D respondents and not by practitioners included State Transition Plans the Impact of Vocational Rehabilitation Case Closure Policies, Transition Service Gaps, Cooperative Employment/Independent Living Program, Balance of Employment Incentives, Differences in Eligibility Requirements, OSER's Transition Goals, the need for School Follow-up, and Employer's Personnel Policies.

As might be expected, practitioners' ratings tended to cluster around the areas most directly related to the types of service delivery they provided (Table 3). Although they agreed with the R & D respondents on many areas, they included in the 20 issues rated most highly, nine that were not included in the top 20 of the R & D respondents as follows:

Early work experiences

Special education teachers' role definitions

Preparation of students to use transition services

TABLE 1

Combined ratings of all respondents for policy relatedness and need for research.

Description	* n	Total	Overall Mean**	Overall Rate	Rank Within Category
Service Agency Mission	38	85	2.36	69	10
Trace Federal Policies	46	126	2.74	41.5	7
Differentiation of Effective and Ineffective agencies	46	133	2.89	27.5	4.5
Transition Planning Mechanisms	46	127	2.76	40	6
Modifications Needed in Service Agencies	46	153	3.33	2	1
Cooperative Employment/ Independent Living Programs	46	133	2.89	27.5	4.5
Insulation of Handicapped Against Job Loss	46	116	2.52	59.5	8
School/Rehabilitation Use of JTPA	46	106	2.30	71	11
State Transition Plans	46	139	3.02	14	2
Agency Organizational Structure	46	114	2.48	62	9
Gaps in Transition Services	46	137	2.98	18.5	3
Cross Purposes of Employment Efforts	46	102	2.22	77	6
Multidisciplinary Participation	46	118	2.57	54.5	4
Transfer of Responsibility Mechanisms	44	144	3.27	4	1
Gaps in Service Delivery	46	109	2.37	68	5
Differences in Eligibility Requirements	46	137	2.98	18.5	2
Formal Transition Agreements	42	113	2.69	45.5	3
Rehabilitation and JTPA	40	89	2.23	76	17
Youth's Preclusion From Services	38	83	2.18	79	18
Early Work Experience	40	118	2.95	22.5	4
Effective Job Development Techniques	46	104	2.26	72	15
Individual or Situation Focus	46	119	2.59	53	12
Guidelines for Appropriate Services	42	56	1.33	82	14
Functional High School Curriculum	46	139	3.02	14	2
Special Education Teacher's Role Definitions	44	119	2.70	43.5	9
Specialization of Transition Personnel	46	112	2.43	65	13
Preparation of Students for Transition	46	132	2.87	30	6
High School Graduation Requirements	46	143	3.11	8	1
High School on-the-job Training	46	136	2.96	21	3
Usefulness of External Job Trainers	44	111	2.52	59.5	11
High School Curriculum Adjustments	46	128	2.78	38.5	7
Post-Placement Accountability	38	111	2.92	24.5	5

---

* N = number of ratings for both policy relationship and research need.

** Overall Mean = mean of the number of ratings for both policy relationship and research need (range 0 - 4).

TABLE 1 cont.

Description	n*	Total	Overall Mean**	Overall Rate	Rank Within Category
Gender Differences	46	103	2.24	73	16
Long-Term Employment Maintainance	44	115	2.61	51	10
Characteristics of More and Less Successful Transition Programs	46	126	2.74	41.5	8
Impact of P. L. 98-199 on Transition	46	130	2.82	33.5	2
Impact of Medical Requirements	42	124	2.95	22.5	1
Salient Differences in "Appropriate Services"	44	124	2.82	33.5	3
Effect of Serving Most Severely Disabled	46	129	2.80	35.5	4
Impact of Fear of Litigation	46	103	2.24	74	5.5
Service Provider's Knowledge of Due Process	46	95	2.06	81	6
Costs of Litigation	46	103	2.24	74	5.5
Transition Accountability Factors	44	133	2.02	14	3
Differences in Diagnostic Terminology	42	89	2.12	80	8
Need for Increased School Follow-up	42	135	3.21	7	1
Status of Follow-up Data	46	122	2.65	48	7
Assessment and Employment Outcomes	42	126	3.00	16	4
Impact of Variations in Eligibility Criteria	46	130	2.83	32	6
Impact of Case Closure Accountability	42	129	3.07	10	2
Service to "Easiest to Place"	40	114	2.85	31	5
Knowledge of Employment Securities Personnel	40	101	2.53	58	2
Preparation of Teacher Trainees for Transition	44	123	2.80	35.5	1
Use of State-of-the-Art Transition Technology	46	108	2.35	70	1
Cost-Effectiveness of Rehabilitation	40	122	3.05	11	1
Proportion of Funds for Employment Training	46	112	2.43	65	4
Impact of P. L. 98-199 on Transition	46	130	2.82	33.5	2
Impact of Medical Requirements	42	124	2.95	22.5	1
Salient Differences in "Appropriate Services"	44	124	2.82	33.5	3
Effect of Serving Most Severely Disabled	46	129	2.80	35.5	4
Impact of Fear of Litigation	46	103	2.24	74	5.5
Service Provider's Knowledge of Due Process	46	95	2.06	81	6
Costs of Litigation	46	103	2.24	74	5.5
Transition Accountability Factors	44	133	2.02	14	3
Differences in Diagnostic Terminology	42	89	2.12	80	8
Need for Increased School Follow-up	42	135	3.21	7	1
Status of Follow-up Data	46	122	2.65	48	7

TABLE 1 cont.

Description	* n	Total	Overall Mean**	Overall Rate	Rank Within Category
Assessment and Employment Outcomes	42	126	3.00	16	4
Impact of Variations in Eligibility Criteria	46	130	2.83	32	6
Impact of Case Closure Accountability	42	129	3.07	10	2
Service to "Easiest to Place"	40	114	2.85	31	5
Knowledge of Employment Securities Personnel	40	101	2.53	58	2
Preparation of Teacher Trainees for Transition	44	123	2.80	35.5	1
Use of State-of-the-Art Transition Technology	46	108	2.35	70	1
Cost-Effectiveness of Rehabilitation	40	122	3.05	11	1
Proportion of Funds for Employment Training	46	112	2.43	65	4
OSER's Goals	44	142	3.23	6	1
Post-Secondary Vocational Preparation	40	115	2.88	29	4
Sheltered Workshops' "Catch-22" Situation	46	137	2.98	18.5	3
Rural vs. Urban Transition Services	38	117	3.08	9	2
Recreation/Leisure support Services	40	102	2.55	56.5	6
Interagency Cooperation for Social Networks	46	121	2.63	50	5
Community Social Networks	46	114	2.48	62	7

TABLE 2

Twenty Most Highly Rated Policy Issues by Transition Research and Developers.

Rank	Issues	(n)*	Combined		Policy		Need	
			Total	X**	Total	X	Total	X
1.	Balance of incentives	(26)	92	3.54	47	3.61	45	3.46
2.	Modifications needed in service agencies	(28)	96	3.43	46	3.29	50	3.57
3.	OSERs goals	(27)	91	3.37	49	3.50	42	3.23
4.	Employer incentives and long-term employment	(26)	87	3.35	42	3.23	45	3.46
5.	Misinterpretation of SSI, SSDI regulations	(24)	80	3.33	42	3.5	38	3.17
6.5	Transfer of responsibility mechanisms	(26)	86	3.31	45	3.46	41	3.15
6.5	Subsidies for benefit programs	(26)	86	3.31	46	3.54	40	3.08
8.	Need for increased school follow-up	(26)	85	3.27	42	3.23	43	3.30
9.	Post-placement accountability	(24)	78	3.25	43	3.58	35	2.92
10.	Employer's personnel policies	(22)	71	3.09	37	3.36	34	3.09
11.	State transition plans	(28)	88	3.14	46	3.29	42	3.00
12.	Rural vs. urban transition services	(24)	75	3.15	37	3.08	38	3.17
13.	Impact of case closure accountability	(26)	81	3.12	45	3.46	36	2.77
14.5	High school graduation requirements	(28)	87	3.11	44	3.14	43	3.07
14.5	Use of vocational education set-aside money	(28)	87	3.11	45	3.21	42	3.00
16.	Gaps in transition services	(28)	85	3.04	43	3.07	42	3.00
18.	Cooperative employment/independent living programs	(28)	84	3.00	42	3.00	42	3.00
18.	Differences in eligibility requirements	(28)	84	3.00	48	3.43	36	2.57
18.	Functional high school curriculum	(28)	84	3.00	38	2.71	46	3.29
21.	Impact of Medicaid requirements	(26)	77	2.96	44	3.38	33	2.54
21.	Assessment and employment outcomes	(26)	77	2.96	38	2.92	39	3.00
21.	Sheltered workshops' "Catch-22" situation	(28)	83	2.96	41	2.93	42	3.00

* number of ratings combined

** number of ratings for policy or need varied

TABLE 3

Twenty Most Highly Rated Policy Issues by Transition Practitioners

Rank	Issues	(n)*	Combined		Policy		Need	
			Total	X**	Total	X	Total	X
1.	High school curriculum adjustments	(13)	49	3.77	23	3.83	26	3.71
2.	Subsidies for benefit programs	(12)	43	3.58	22	3.67	21	3.50
3.	Rural vs. urban transition services	(13)	46	3.54	20	3.33	26	3.71
4.5	Impact of Medicaid requirements	(14)	49	3.50	25	3.57	24	3.43
4.5	Privatization of services	(10)	35	3.50	18	3.60	17	3.40
6.	Post-placement accountability	(11)	38	3.45	21	3.50	17	3.40
7.	Long-term employment maintenance	(14)	48	3.43	24	3.43	24	3.43
8.	Misinterpretation of SSI, SSDI regulations	(10)	34	3.40	16	3.20	18	3.60
9.	Sheltered workshops' "Catch-22" situation	(16)	54	3.38	26	3.25	28	3.50
10.	Effect of serving most severely disabled	(15)	50	3.33	24	3.43	26	3.25
11.5	Functional high school curriculum	(16)	51	3.19	27	3.38	24	3.00
11.5	Assessment and employment outcomes	(16)	51	3.19	28	3.50	23	2.88
14	Gaps in service delivery	(15)	47	3.13	28	4.00	19	2.37
14	Early work experiences	(16)	50	3.13	27	3.38	23	2.88
14	Preparation of students to use transition services	(16)	50	3.13	27	3.38	23	2.88
16.5	Special education teacher's role definitions	(12)	37	3.08	19	3.16	18	3.00
16.5	Trends in service delivery mechanisms	(12)	37	3.08	20	3.33	17	2.83
19	High school graduation requirements	(15)	46	3.07	22	3.14	24	3.00
19	High school on-the-job training	(15)	46	3.07	23	3.29	23	2.88

* number of individual ratings

** number of combined ratings

High school on-the-job training

High school curriculum adjustments

Long-term employment maintenance

The effect of serving the most severely disabled

Trends in service delivery mechanisms

The privatization of services

Some issues that all respondents rated in the top 20 but were rated more highly by practitioners included the need to examine the differences in rural versus urban transition services and the "Catch-22" problem of sheltered workshops and work activity centers.

A total of 49 different items were selected by respondents at least once as one of the 10 most important issues. The 12 issues selected most frequently were as follows:

Differentiation of effective and ineffective agencies

Modifications needed in service agencies

Functional high school curriculum

OSER's Transition goals

Rural versus urban transition services

High school graduation requirements

Characteristics of more and less successful transition programs

Transition accountability factors

Need for increased school follow-up

Subsidies for benefit programs

New job markets

Employer's hiring policies

Respondents' additions, modifications, or comments regarding the issue statements were highly varied. Although there were some additions to the issues, most of the comments pertain to redirecting the focus of research questions.

DISCUSSION

Despite the increased attention given in the literature to transition issues and problems, there are still many issues for which consensus is lacking in terms of which is most critical or what actions need to be taken or are effective. This study obtained appraisals of 82 transition policy issues in the forms of ratings of their relevance to policy and need for research from transition R & D specialists and practitioner/ administrators. The method of inquiry was to obtain information, in-depth, concentrating on a selected number of respondents rather than to survey a broad array of respondents on a limited number of issues.

It was surprising that, regardless of training or background--vocational education, developmental disabilities, vocational rehabilitation, advocacy or special education--the majority of respondents reflected cross-disciplinary opinions as well as understanding of the demands and restrictions placed on the various service programs involved in transition. Little variation in ratings was evident on issues that received either very high or extremely low overall ratings. Responses were more variable on issues that were rated somewhere in between. Factors that pertained to disabled persons' incentives for working, employers' incentives for hiring disabled workers or disincentives for working were of primary importance to most. Fortunately, many legislative and regulatory changes have either occurred or are under review that will have a large impact on employment incentives and disincentives.

Several items pertaining to the relationship of high schools to transition goals--early work experiences, school, on-the-job training, functional curriculum, and preparation for post-secondary education--received high policy relatedness/need ratings, particularly from practitioners. Several comments indicated the greatest need was for mildly handicapped high schoolers as compared to more severely handicapped persons.

The dilemma of adult services with a projected expanding population of clients and limited funding outlook was of concern to both groups. They expressed particular concern about exploring the potential for supported employment and the ability of the business community to accommodate supported employment.

Finally, the differences between urban and rural transition problems pertaining to each of the areas mentioned above received consistently higher ratings regardless of the repondents' backgrounds.

Significant areas of needed research are quite obvious from the appraisal results. One area is related to the process of translating federal initiatives into state and local service policy-planning for transition. A second area, pertaining to school policy, is the marked contrast between the unemployment levels of mildly handicapped school leavers (completers and drop-outs) with the fairly extensive work and vocational training experiences that have been developed in the schools over the years. A third area pertains to a seemingly rediscovered employment placement and training program emphasis; supported employment. Other papers in this monograph address selected facets of each of these three areas of policy research needs.

Although each of these issues has been addressed at least indirectly in previous research, information is either incomplete or unclear that will permit policy makers or implementors to confidently set directions on critical areas of transition for disabled persons. Further research in each of these areas should be aimed at clarifying when policy decisions do and do not lead to corresponding actions and resultant changes in the transition status of disabled persons.

The focus of attention regarding transition development and analysis has been primarily "top down." The federal initiatives have been launched in an attempt directed at affecting state and local policy by example (research and model programs) and by adjustments in legislation (PL 98-199 of 1985; Carl Perkins Act of 1983). Although these activities have served as catalysts, change that is long-lasting must originate at the local level (Benz & Halpern, 1987; Cox, Frank, Hocutt, & Kuligowski, 1984; Ballantyne, McGee, Patton, & Cohen, 1985). The implementation at the local level of the particulars of broader policies advocated by federal and state agencies will eventually reshape and give credence to those policies (Castellani, 1987). Information gained from the practicalities of implementation by service providers, if carefully analyzed and used systematically by bureaucratic agencies, could serve to evolve a functional relationship between intented policies (i.e., a school district's work experience training emphasis).

The development, adoption, and implementation of policy is an interactive process between the policymakers and implementors. The process may occur systematically and rapidly or it may occur haltingly and by happenstance. Current writings on the analysis of policy development processes are relatively generic (cf. Nagel & Neef, 1972). Many policy study groups (e.g., University of Washington Policy Institute, George Peabody Policy Studies Group) have developed guidelines for generic policy analysis and development. Although many of these guidelines may be applicable to the study of transition policy development, there are a number of unique features pertaining to the multi-agency cooperative thrust of transition that warrant a particular study effort (Johnson et al., 1987).

The need, expressed earlier, to establish functional relationships between different levels of policy development and implementation is evident from an examination of the predominant transition policy research approaches represented in the literature. Most research from which policy implications have been drawn is descriptive in nature. Many studies are reports of surveys (cf. Halpern & Benz, 1984; Maddox & Edgar, 1984; Edgar, 1985, 1987; Hasazi, Gordon, & Roe, 1985), site visits and interviews (Cox, et al., 1984; Ballantyne, et al., 1985) or analyses of extant data bases (cf. Braddock, 1987). Although some research is reported on the employment status of handicapped persons, no experimental manipulations or static comparisons were involved in the policy-related studies. Experimental studies of federal model programs have been reported (cf. Kerachsky & Thornton, 1987), but no attempts to experimentally manipulate transition policy change or implementation processes, and document their effects on transition programming or outcomes with handicapped youth have been reported. Considering the non-experimental nature of much of this research, it is surprising that recommendations for effective transition policy making are as prevalent. Granted, the research task is a difficult one, but, without some demonstration of the impact of transition policy decisions, the influence of these decisions must remain largely in the realm of conjecture.

In conclusion, research on transition policy development and implementation offers some unique challenges. Research is needed that focuses on de facto policy decisions and their outcomes at the level of the local service provider, and how federal and state policies are reflected there. When the recommendations of transition leaders in the fields of vocational education, rehabilitation, special education, and developmental disabilities are compiled, the enormity of the task is evident. An immediate concern is to achieve consensus on priority policy issues in order to direct a program of policy research. Because of the multi-disciplinary emphasis of the current transition initiative, information is needed regarding efficient processes of policy development and implementation. Finally, there is a need to functionally verify at least the key aspects of transition policy decisions in order to lend credence to what is typically speculation about results of the policy development and implementation process. The catalytic period of government initiative is typically short-lived and whatever long-lasting effects of these initiatives that may occur are determined by policies that become instilled and reflected in daily routine program activity.

TRANSITION PLANNING METHODS AND PROGRESS: A NATIONAL STUDY

Joseph J. Stowitschek

INTRODUCTION

Planning for the transition into adult life of persons with handicapping conditions has been gaining in momentum during the 1980's. Many state and local agencies are quite extensively involved in assisting direct service providers to develop and implement transition programming and supported employment alternatives. Others are yet in the beginning stages. As Paul Wehman (1981) has noted, careful and systematic planning is one of the keys to the success of vocational programming.

How careful and systematic are transition plans? To what extent do local services reflect the intent of these plans? Preliminary inquiries (Ballantyne et al., 1985) suggest that the procedures and outcomes of these activities are highly disparate from one program to another. Because of its cross-disciplinary nature, transition programming cannot rest on the performance of one agency. Rather, a complete picture of successful transition planning, methods and outcomes, can best be derived from a composite analysis of all agencies involved.

The literature pertaining to studies of transition planning is sparse but includes regional case studies and national surveys of a concentrated focus. Among the reports of transition efforts, a set of "best practices" is emerging that may be used as a framework for comparison.

NATIONWIDE TRANSITION PLANNING FOCUS

Persons with severe handicaps have been integrated into school programs for several years. They have entered secondary programs and many are approaching adulthood. McDonnell, Wilcox, and Boles (1986) surveyed state administrators of vocational rehabilitation, special education, and residential service programs for persons with severe handicaps. They obtained information on the numbers of persons on waiting lists for services, the number exiting public schools, and the plans for service expansion. One of their findings was that the numbers exiting schools far exceeded the numbers who could conceivably be accommodated in the expanded programs. Because of the focus of their study, they did not attempt to explore other aspects of planning for transition. In their discussion of the Utah community-based transition project, Hardman and McDonnell (1987) stressed the importance of schools taking the lead in the transition planning process.

Vocational education transition policy and planning is the area of concentration for a group of researchers who are based in Minnesota. Weatherman, Stevens, and Kranz (1986) reported a review of literature in which conclusions of studies were synthesized in order to direct further policy research. They concluded from their synthesis that (a) long-range planning is needed in order to bring about lasting beneficial effects of transition efforts on the employment success of handicapped individuals; (b) local and extended follow-up of school leavers is needed; (c) parent involvement in the transition process must be enhanced; (d) personnel preparation programs must concentrate their efforts on equipping teachers to meet transition goals, and (e) regardless of the proliferation of inter-agency agreements, these efforts have had relatively little impact on service delivery systems. Johnson, Bruininks, and Thurlow (1987) suggest that problems with management and the lack of policy consensus underline these issues. They question the effectiveness of inter-agency collaboration, suggesting that the reason that it doesn't work is that critical process steps have not been defined, thus leading to poor implementation.

The transition of moderately and severely handicapped persons into supported employment is a major part of the federal initiative. The Region X Rehabilitation Services Administration (Supported employment, 1986) reported results of a survey of state directors of vocational rehabilitation programs. Although the survey was designed to get information on an array of activities to develop supported employment services and was directed toward vocational rehabilitation agencies, it did include four questions regarding planning (inter-agency cooperation, advisory group activity, written long and short-range plans). Their findings suggested that states were highly disparate in these activities, with many states extensively involved in inter-agency activities and others reporting little activity. Little has been synthesized regarding the extent of agencies' involvement in other planning activities (i.e., transfer of responsibility mechanisms, designation of primary transition mediators, information access by adult service agencies on school leavers as well as school completers, inter-agency cooperation between developmental disabilities programs and public schools).

REGIONAL TRANSITION PLANNING FOCUS

Much attention has been given to exemplary programs in recent years (cf. Rusch & Phelps, 1987; Hardman & McDonnell, 1987; Kerachsky & Thornton, 1987). Some exploration of exemplary planning activity has also been carried-out. Descriptions of planning activities were included in the case analyses of nine exemplary programs reported by Ballantyne et al. (1985). Although their report was not data-based, it included descriptions of characteristics that were consistently present across programs, as well as characteristics that were unique. The report provides information on desirable characteristics of quality transition programs. The extent of these characteristics as represented in the total spectrum of transition programming is not clear.

Local transition activity has been the concern of policy analysts who attempted to examine the relationship between planning and implementation. Cox and his associates (Cox, Frank, Hocutt, & Kuligowski, 1984) visited 21 local education agencies in nine states. They pointed out that the local agencies were, "...not selected to be representative of LEA's across the nation" (p. 3). Findings from case description summaries pertaining to transition planning were that: (a) either there is no follow-up or limited follow-up of school leavers, (b) no formal linkages from secondary to post-secondary education programs were evident, (c) there were no formal linkages between education and adult services or transfer of responsibility mechanisms. However, there were a number of cooperative agreements. Although they described on-going education activities with thoroughness, it is doubtful whether national or state profiles of transition planning and implementation activities can be drawn from this information.

The relationship between secondary special education and adult services was the target of work done by Halpern and his associates (1985, 1986), and Benz and Halpern (1986, 1987) describe results and implications of a state-wide survey of transition programs in school districts in Oregon. They obtained information from school administrators, teachers, and parents. Some major findings included concerns in the following areas: (a) lack of coordination across agencies, (b) the lack of follow-up of information on post-school adjustment of special education school leavers, (c) no individual designated as coordinator of transition activities, and (d) limited focus of transition planning and programming. In a later report (Benz & Halpern, 1987) they stress the need to plan for a range of post-secondary outcomes to develop formal versus informal inter-agency agreements and to develop coordinating teams.

In summary, glimpses of the larger picture of transition activity are provided in the literature. Some quite clear representations of pockets of transition planning activity are available. Considerable attention has been devoted to enumerating elements of successful transition programming. A national profile of the components of transition planning activity across the major agencies involved that could be used for policy analysis purposes has yet to be derived.

PROBLEM

Numerous transition specialists have identified the need to carefully plan for the development of transition services at all levels. Several guidelines have been offered by the federal government and by transition experts (see literature synthesis section of this report). Although some reports of model transition planning endeavors have been reported in the literature, it is uncertain whether such planning is common practice in all states and to what extent such planning reflects recommended state-of-the-art measures. Further, if such plans are documented, it is uncertain whether they are being implemented by local service providers.

PURPOSE

A plan for a series of studies has been implemented that will help to clarify the status of transition planning for individuals with handicaps. This plan includes studies to, (a) compile a national picture of the process of transition planning, (b) develop profiles for each state regarding a variety of planning elements, (c) trace the implementation of those plans through selected service programs and activities, and (d) formulate guidelines for further transition planning. The first study, described here, was conducted to accomplish objectives "a" and "b."

The purpose of this study was to provide a documented base of information on formal transition plans of state agencies responsible for educational, transitional, and adult services for handicapped persons. Such written documents represent official policy and provide reference points from which comparisons of planning to implementation may eventually be made. The question of interest was, to what extent to state agency plans reflect, (a) the intent of the federal initiatives and (b) the published literature explaining crucial components of sound transition planning?

SUBJECTS. The subjects for this study consisted of written documents supplied by responding rehabilitation and special education agencies of the states, territories, and protectorates of the United States (henceforth referred to as states). Eligible documents fell into seven categories: (1) state cooperative agreements, (2) local cooperative agreements, (3) state service plans, (4) transition planning documents, (5) policy and procedures manuals of the responding agencies, (6) individual transition plans, (7) other transition documents (e.g., training booklets, reports, and recommendations of transition advisory groups, etc.). The parameters of these seven categories are defined in the procedures section of this study report. The categories were arrived at based on a preliminary review of documents available in the Rehabilitation Services Region X office. This office collects documents of rehabilitation agencies, special education agencies, and agencies responsible for services to developmentally disabled persons.

INSTRUMENTS. A checklist and "Tran Plan" document analysis form were prepared for this study. Recommendations pertaining to transition planning needs and "best practices" were drawn from the literature cited and grouped according to generic category (Table 1). Twelve checklist categories were developed from these groupings. The checklist contained spaces for listing titles of documents, document sources, and dates for verifying the currency of the document with a respondent's initials. The

Tran Plan analysis form included a listing of planning elements according to 12 transition planning categories. The listings were derived from literature pertaining to transition as representing "best practices" in transition planning. The document analysis form allowed for the recording of categories of planning represented in a document, the presence or absence of listed planning features, and a narrative description of the document.

PROCEDURES. It was decided to focus the study on vocational rehabilitation (VR) and special education (SE) agencies because they are often either the pivotal point between school and employment or the target of interagency cooperation. The initial source of documents were the 10 rehabilitation services administration (RSA) offices. Besides administering federal vocational rehabilitation programs, they serve as an information source and a repository for materials from vocational education, special education, developmental disabilities, JTPA, Projects With Industry, and other agencies associated with transition for persons with disabilities. Requests for documents were mailed to RSA offices in February of 1987. Following receipt of the mid-level of approval of the study proposal by the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation (CSAVR), document requests were mailed to 68 state vocational rehabilitation agencies, agencies for the blind, as well as similar offices in U. S. territories and protectorates. In October of 1987, a follow-up mailing of requests for documents was completed. Documents from an additional thirty state agencies were received in response, adding seven new states to the data base.

Titles of documents received from the RSA regional offices were listed on the individual checklists for each state so that the state offices could verify the currency of these listings as well as supply supplemental listings. A similar mailing to 60 state special education agencies was completed in collaboration with the Washington Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Documents received were coded by state and by document category. The staff of the Policy Systems and Development Research Team were the reviewers of documents received. The team was comprised of the senior investigator, a graduate assistant in special education, a graduate assistant in Policy, Governance and Administration, and a graduate assistant in Curriculum and Instruction. All three graduate assistants had experience as special education teachers. Training of document reviewers was conducted using a "dry-run" review process with documents on hand that were not part of the returns from state agencies. Reviewers read portions of document copies, independently completed corresponding portions of the Tran Plan analysis form and compared their recordings. They discussed the results and revised their procedures until they independently agreed on 80% or greater of the recording categories. At that point, they began reviewing the official documents received from state agencies. In October 1987, a new graduate assistant was trained to code documents received from June 1987 to February 1988. Interrater reliability was calculated for 15 documents from 5 states (See Table 2). Reliability ranged from 62-92% with a mean reliability of 83%.

RESULTS

Responses to date have been received from 52 of the 60 states, territories and protectorates listed (87%). Two state agencies, Texas and Wisconsin, sent letters indicating that transition document development was in process and that none could be made available as of yet. The representation of the respondents is geographically distributed with the exception that territories and protectorates are not well represented (4 of 9). There were no states with large populations from which no response was received.

To date, we have received total of 331 documents which match the criteria for inclusion in any of the seven document categories. State level interagency cooperative agreements were received from 40 states and samples of local cooperative agreements from 23 states. Portions of state plans pertaining to transition were received from 35 states and state transition plans were received from 29 states. Agency policies and procedures documents were received from 17 states and samples of individual transition plans were sent by 9 states. Twenty states sent documents fitting the criteria for other transition documents.

The most frequently received form of document related to transition planning was state interagency cooperative agreements. Seventy-seven percent of the responding states supplied such agreements, ranging from one-page memoranda to multi-page, detailed contractual arrangements, accompanied by service responsibility matrices. Of those states sending state level agreements, the numbers ranged from 1 to 11 documents. Dual (two-way) agency agreements between vocational rehabilitation and special education offices were the most often included, with agreements between vocational rehabilitation and developmental disabilities offices being the second most common. Multi-agency agreements (three-way up to seven-way) were also common, with agreements between vocational rehabilitation, vocational education and special education state offices being the most common. Advocacy groups and agencies for the blind, deaf, health, social services and housing were also included. No agreements were obtained that included Job Training and Placement Act or Project With Industry representatives. Samples of local agreements were typically patterned after the state agency agreements, often being word-for-word with the exception of the titles and signers. A state level agency was often included in the agreements. Of those states sending local agreements, the numbers of agreements per state ranged from 1 to 26.

Some states sent their entire state plans, while others sent two or three pages addressing transition services relating to persons with disabilities. Typically, vocational rehabilitation state plans consisted of standard assurances with attachments explaining plans for developing transition services, such as supported employment. Special education and vocational education state plans were more varied and extensive (particularly three-year plans). However, the portions specified describing vocational or transition services for handicapped persons rarely exceeded one and one-half pages, if all sentences and paragraphs were combined.

State transition plans were often combinations of needs assessments, program evaluations and recommendations or guidelines for transition service development. Some were distributed state-wide while others were used internally by state agencies.

Individual transition plan (ITP) samples, although sent by only 17% of the responding states, consisted of guidelines for developing and implementing ITPs, forms for recording ITP elements, or combinations of both.

Agency policy and procedures documents consisted of descriptions of services provided by agencies pertaining to transition, statements of philosophy and policy, or regulations regarding the conduct of transition services.

Other transition documents included disseminables regarding transition services, instructions for how to utilize services, proceedings of conferences that were subsequently used as information dissemination material regarding agency services, or descriptions of inservice or preservice training activities regarding transition.

Table 4 depicts a summary of the document review completed across all states by each category of planning activity. A "yes" under a category indicates that one or more topics pertaining to that category were represented in one or more of the documents received from a particular state. Representation at this level of review is interpreted liberally, meaning that the topic was at least mentioned. The treatment of a topic ranged from it being only labeled (e.g., "Improvements needed in transition services include the development of local interagency cooperation, more inservice training . . . ") to being described in detail over several pages (e.g., step-by-step procedures for implementing interagency agreements).

Forty-nine of the states sending documents (94%) addressed interagency planning or cooperation. Formal agreements were the usual sources representing this activity. However, the other six types of documents also yielded information on interagency planning. This was by far the predominant activity.

The development of a common data base of students transitioning from school to employment or adult services, or from adult service programs to employment was addressed in documents of 36 states (69%). Few states described a data base currently in existence. Many cooperative agreements addressed the willingness or intent to share information on referrals and those eligible for services. The need to develop such data bases was expressed in other documents (e.g., state transition plans).

The evaluation of outcomes of transition was mentioned in the documents of 30 states (58%). Few of the states identified the use of employment data, numbers of students entering/exiting post-secondary education programs or transition quotas as data sources to evaluate service programs. The more common evaluative statement found in the documents was a pledge to ". . . evaluate the effectiveness of this agreement."

Individual transition planning was addressed in the documents of 28 states (54%). For the most part, an individual transition plan was described briefly. However, for 10 states (19%), a transition plan or guidelines for developing one could be identified as a distinct document. Table 4 depicts a partial (P*) plan for 13 states (25%) in which the joint development of IEPs, IWRPs or IPPs are encouraged. This usually entailed an agreement to have an agency representative sit in as a member of the individual planning team.

The inservice or preservice preparation of staff to provide transition services was addressed in the documents of 44 states (85%). Preservice training needs and plans were described in detail for few of these states. The more predominant statement was pertinent to a sharing of information or expertise across agencies.

Transition task forces and study groups, governors' task forces on employment for the handicapped, advisory groups and interagency planning teams were addressed in documents from 34 states (65%). Nine states sent memoranda, minutes of meetings and detailed reports of such groups. Idaho, Illinois, Maryland, Minnesota, Massachusetts and Ohio, for instance, have planning groups that have assisted in the formation and re-formation of transition-related services. Other states have expressed the need for a coordinating body.

Adjustments to existing services or curricula was mentioned in the documents of 28 states (54%). This was most often mentioned as a need. However, some agencies have described the re-shaping of vocational or rehabilitation services.

Parent-family participation was mentioned in the documents of 33 states. There was (63%) beyond required participation in IEP development and monitoring. Those states describing individual transition planning typically included provisions for greater parent involvement.

The development of new services was discussed in documents of 32 states (62%). The majority of the discussions centered around developing new supported employment programs.

Documents of 25 states (48%) addressed changes in service regulations, statutes or legislation pertaining to transition services. Approximately half of the seventeen states supplied legislative resolutions, state legislative acts or bills pertaining to the transition of youth from school to employment. Four established a transition agency and the rest delegated responsibility for either lead agency or interagency coordination. A transition mandate per se was not evident.

The dissemination of information on transition services and needs to the general public was addressed in documents of 36 states (69%). The majority of these documents were brochures, printed guides and pamphlets. Plans for public awareness campaigns were also included.

Employer involvement in transition planning was addressed in documents of 33 states (63%). For the most part, mention was made of the need to involve employers. As examples of concrete employer involvement, documents from Florida and Idaho describe how representatives from business and industry serve on transition planning committees.

Examination of the breadth of transition activity reflected through the documents received shows that documented activity varies considerably. Documents from 15 states, Alabama, American Samoa, Arizona, Georgia, Guam, Indiana, Lousiana, Michigan, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Virgina, and the Virgin Islands reflect transition planning activity in six or fewer of the 12 categories. Documents from twelve states, Alaska, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, North Dakota, Ohio, and Oregon, reflect transition activity in eleven categories, and four states, California, Iowa, Minnesota, and Washington, reflect transition activity in all 12 categories. The results from Oregon are drawn primarily from one set of documents prepared by an outside agent. Evaluation of outcomes of transition is most often under-represented in the documents of states reflecting high transition activity.

DISCUSSION

The first in a series of transition planning studies was carried out to develop an information base regarding documented transition planning activity that is becoming incorporated into routine service agency channels. Seven types of transition planning documents were obtained from rehabilitation and special education agencies in 52 states. The initial review conducted for the purposes of this study revealed that state interagency agreements were the most readily available type of document, and reflected the predominant form of transition planning activity as state level cooperation; with local interagency agreements being less common. The fewest number of any type of document supplied was individual transition plans or guidelines. Documents reflecting legislative actions regarding transition services were also few in number.

The checklist review procedures and recording categories tended to discriminate between states giving more versus less thorough treatment of the activities in the documents supplied. However, the liberal interpretation of a document's representation of a category of activity (topic is mentioned) tended to diminish, rather than reflect substantive differences. In this first level of study, it was considered to be more appropriate to err on the side of including a document that contributes little information regarding a transition planning activity than to risk excluding a document that may describe a brief but unique approach to that activity. In a subsequent study, we used those document-by-category groupings and conducted a more in-depth analysis of selected transition planning activities.

In confirmation of concerns expressed in the literature (cf. Johnson et al., 1987), the transition planning documents revealed a high frequency of state level agreements to cooperate. Readings of these documents reveal that nearly all are focused exclusively on the process of providing services with no specified accountable commitment to transition outcomes. In a more positive vein, the planning groups of several states have gone beyond the recommendation stage and are becoming directly involved in the implementation of policies recommended. Other states are developing transition agencies with authority and responsibility for developing and installing transition services as routine programming. It is unfortunate that these groups and agencies are reflected in so few of the documents reviewed. The natural extension of mandated appropriate services (e.g., P.L. 94-142, P.L. 98-199) into transition planning is reflected in the ITPs that are beginning to come into use. They are also in the minority and may vary considerably in the extent to which they reflect "best practices" (cf. McDonnell et al., 1985). Some crucial areas of transition planning policy development and implementation needs have emerged from this preliminary investigation. Planning areas of particular interest are: (a) the need to plan for the development of transition data bases; (b) the need to build into agencies' service monitoring activities routine program evaluation that is transition outcome based; (c) the need to determine and promote the use of effective individual transition planning procedures; (d) the need to explore the potential for a single transition coordinating agency; (e) the need to determine the benefits and shortcomings of additional mandating of services; and finally (f) the need to determine the relationship between planning reflected in documents and transition activities that are implemented in order to shed light on which planning activities and approaches are the most functional.

Table 1. Item Sources for the Transition Planning Checklist

Category	Transition Needs and Problems	Source
1. Interagency Activity	- Transfer of responsibility mechanisms - LEA plays major role, SEA plays minor role - Local agreement	Cox, et al., 1984 Brown, et al., 1987
	- Local coordination, coordinated planning - Provide information on services	Hardman & McDonnell, 1987
	- Formal local interagency agreements - Technical assistance/support to teachers - Supply student data to adult service agencies	Benz & Halpern, 1987
	- Written agreements are no guarantee of cooperation	Johnson, McLaughlin, Christianson, 1982
	- Coordination - Eligibility requirements	Stodden & Boone, 1987
	- Coordination with time limited services	Will, 1985
	- Coordination	Calkins, et al., 1985
	- Share information on services - Coordinated service planning - Plan explicit objectives or outcomes	Johnson, Bruininks, & Thurlow, 1987
	- Coordinated service planning	Shalock, 1985
	- Planning multidisciplinary participation	Wehman, Kregel, & Barcus, 1985
	- Technical assistance/support	Oregon Department of Education, 1985
	- Types of interagency collaboration	Audette, 1980
	- Compare student characteristics to resources - Focus on implementation	Weatherman, et al., 1986
	- Plan for a lead agency	Johnson, Bruininks, & Thurlow, 1987
	- Plan for a lead agency	Bates, 1985

	Category	Transition Needs and Problems	Source
1.	Interagency Activity (con't.)	- Emphasize local agreements and cooperative planning - State agency structure can hinder interagency planning - Transition planning and coordinating committees - Formality of agreement - Use an independent facilitator	Ballantyne et al., 1985
		- Provide technical assistance across agencies	Oregon Department of Education, 1985
		- Need for local ownership in implementation of transition models and planning	Knowlton & Clark, 1987
2.	Transition Data base	- Transition needs assessment system - Transition follow-up data base	Bates et al., 1985
		- A school to adult services transition coordinator - School to post-school follow-up data - Resources inventory	Benz & Halpern, 1987
		- Cross agency coordinator - Follow-up data base	Cox et al., 1987
		- Federal mandate requires reporting of graduates - Federal mandate requires reporting of service needs	Hardman & McDonnell, 1987
		- Student tracking system	Weatherman et al., 1986
		- An information exchange	Wehman, Kregel, & Barcus, 1985
3.	Evaluation of Outcomes of Transition	- Standards for comparison	Benz & Halpern, 1987
		- Program results should be a focus	Johnson, Bruininks, & Thurlow, 1987
		- Program evaluation studies - Identify transition related outcome measures	Bates et al., 1985

Category	Transition Needs and Problems	Source
	- Service evaluation is a necessary component	Weatherman et al., 1986
	- Coordination of outcomes as well as services	Mithaug et al., 1987
4. Individual Transition Planning	- Formal transition plans	Hardman & McDonnell, 1987
	- Multi agency, multi year	
	- Special education coordinator position	Cox et al., 1984
	- Coordinating the development of IEPs	
	- Formal transition plans	Bates et al., 1985
	- Joint IEP/IWRP development and coordination	Ballantyne et al., 1985
	- Coodinating team for IEPs	Benz & Halpern
	- Liaison writer	DoKecki, 1975
	- Direction center to coordinate individual planning	Zeller, 1980
	- Interagency team to conduct individual planning	Massachusetts Dept. of Education, 1984
5. Personal Preparation For Transition	- Staff lack transition skills	Johnson et al., 1987
	- Generic preparation for transition	Brown et al., 1985
	- Preparation of vocational educators to work with handicapped persons	Cox et al., 1984
	- Identify competencies for professionals and paraprofessionals working in transition services	Bates et al., 1985
	- Job development, analysis and placement training	Wehman & Kregal, 1985
	- Training in educationally relevant factors	Brown, 1985
	- Inter agency inservice training	Ballantyne et al., 1985
	- Differential role presentation must be pursued to produce transition specialists and job developers	Knowlton & Clark, 1987

Category	Transition Needs and Problems	Source
5. Personnel Preparation For Transition (con't.)	- Develop skills of vocational educators to work with handicapped persons	Weatherman, et al.
6. Transition Planning Organization	- Transition assistance committee	Bates, 1985
	- Direction service	Zeller, 1980
	- Direction center	Elder & MaGrab, 1980
	- External agency - Direction service - Monitoring and evaluation agency	Johnson, et al., 1987
	- Interagency teams	Stodden & Boone, 1987
	- Interagency committee for coordination	Ballantyne, et al., 1985
7. Program Modifications	- Increase participation of handicapped in vocational education - Increase the vocational orientation of special education - Increase the emphasis on work experience	Ballatyne, et al., 1985
	- Emphasize functional curriculum - Increase the involvement of handicapped students in work experience	Brown et al., 1987
	- Functional versus academic emphasis	Edgar, 1987
	- Limited participation of handicapped persons in work study - Prepare handicapped for post secondary education	Cox et al., 1984
	- Increase early employment opportunities for handicapped students - Prepare handicapped to function without special services	Will, 1985
	- Provide early community referenced instruction - Adaptability needed in secondary teaching strategies	Mithaug et al., 1987

Category	Transition Needs and Problems	Source
7. Program Modifications (con't.)	- Back to basics emphasis interferes with transition efforts	
	- Adjust secondary program to reach out to dropouts	Zigmond & Thornton, 1985a, 1985b
	- Adjust curriculum to reflect functional needs	Wehman et al., 1985
	- Prepare vocational education programs to better accommodate handicapped students	
	- Increase the common support service for handicapped persons	Bates et al., 1985
	- The school curriculum should reflect the needs of the labor market	Maddox & Edgar, 1984
	- Adult service must build upon previous services	
	- Adjust vocational education to accommodate employment needs	Hasazzi, Gordon, & Roe, 1985
	- Conflict between back to basics emphasis and vocational emphasis with handicapped persons	Knowlton & Clark
	- Outcomes other than employment should also be emphasized in the curriculum	Benz & Halpern, 1987
8. Service Development	- Major problem for adult handicapped is gaining access to services	Brown et al., 1987
	- A lifelong service support is needed	
	- Linkage services are needed	Stodden & Boone, 198
	- The range of adult services must be expanded	Mithaug et al., 1987
	- Adult service development	Johnson et al., 1987
	- Broaden the range of adult services	Halpern, Close, & Nakon, 1986
	- Adult service for handicapped persons are limited	Hasazi, Gordon, & 1985
	- Expand adult services	Mithaug, Horiuchi, & Fanning, 1985

	Category	Transition Needs and Problems	Source
8.	Service Development (con't.)	- Routine vocational assessment service must be made available	Brown, 1985
		- Integrated services must be developed	Will, 1985
		- Technical assistance to expand available secondary education program options - Expand post secondary services	Bates et al., 1985
		- Improve rural service options	Weatherman et al., 1986
9.	Parent/ Family Participation	- Involve parents in the job finding process	Edgar, 1987
		- Parent involvement is crucial	Shalock et al.
		- Parents must be involved	Shalock & Lilly
		- Include parents in all decisions - Communication with parents	Benz & Halpern, 1987
		- The parents' role is essential in the transition process	Lowder & Zeller, 1984
		- Parent involvement - Involve parents in transition planning	Johnson et al., 1987
		- Parent participation in transition planning	Stodden & Boone
		- Multiple year transition planning must include parents	Gilliams & Coleman
		- Parent assistance in the planning process	Weatherman et al., 1986
		- Parents are key to the success of transition planning	McDonnell, Wilcox, & Boles, 1983
		- Parent education	Hardman & McDonnell, 1987
		- Consumer participation in all phases of services	Wehman et al., 1985
		- Lack of parental incentive is a major problem	Cox et al., 1984

Category	Transition Needs and Problems	Source
10. Changes in Regulation Statutes or Codes	- Mandatory cooperative relationships	Brown et al., 1987
	- Mandatory adult transition services	Johnson et al., 1987
	- Regulations to improve employment incentives - Standardized direction services	Zeller, 1980
	- High school preparation of severely handicapped be directed at quotas for movement to supported work - Standardization of eligibility criteria	Cox et al., 1984
	- Modifications in graduation requirements	Benz & Halpern
	- Graduation requirements	Knowlton & Clark
	- Definitions of disability must be adjusted	Weatherman, 1986
	- Academic emphasis for graduation	Ballantyne et al.
11. Information About Transition Services (Awareness)	- Statewide information campaign	Bates et al., 1987
	- Informed parents	Halpern and Benz
12. Employment Concerns	- Fringe benefits incentives	Johnson et al, 1987
	- Fringe benefits incentives	Weatherman et al., 1985
	- Social security disincentive to employment	Cox et al., 1984
	- Include employers in transition planning	Stodden & Boone, 1987

Table 2
Interrater Reliability

		Range	Mean
10/13			
VERMONT (VT)			
Document # 08	10/13	77-92%	86%
Document # 07	11/13		
Document # 05	12/13		
Document # 06	12/13		
COLORADO (CO)			
Document # 13	11/13	85%	85%
CALIFORNIA (CA)			
Document # 07	10/13	62-92%	77%
Document # 06	8/13		
Document # 05	12/13		
10/14			
KANSAS (KS)			
Document # 11	11/13	77-92%	84%
Document # 12	11/13		
Document # 13	12/13		
Document # 14	8/10		
Document # 15	11/13		
Document # 16	10/13		
10/20			
ILLINOIS (IL)			
Document # 1	10/12	83%	83%
TOTAL		62-92%	83%

TABLE 3
Number and Type of Documents Received by States

State	No. of Doc.	Transition Document Categories State Coop. Agree.	local Coop. Agree.	State Plans	Trans. Plan. Doc.	Agency Policy Proced.	Indiv. Trans. Plan	Other Trans. Doc.
ALABAMA (AL)	3	X	X			X		
ALASKA (AK)	15	X	X	X				X
AMERICA SAMOA (AS)	1	X						
ARIZONA (AZ)	3	X			X			X
ARKANSAS (AR)	1				X			
CALIFORNIA (CA)	6	X	X					X
COLORADO (CO)	13	X		X	X	X		
CONNECTICUT (CT)	7	X			X			X
DELAWARE (DE)	5	X	X		X			X
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (DC)	No Response							
FLORIDA (FL)	14	X	X		X			
GEORGIA (GA)	1	X						
GUAM (GJ)	2	X		X				
HAWAII (HI)	6	X		X		X	X	
IDAHO (ID)	6	X	X	X	X			
ILLINOIS (IL)	4			X	X	X		
INDIANA (IN)	2	X			X			
IOWA (IA)	8	X	X	X	X			X
KANSAS (KS)	15	X		X	X	X	X	X
KENTUCKY (KY)	11	X	X	X	X	X		
LOUISIANA (LA)	10	X	X	X				
MAINE (ME)	13	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SAIPAN, MARIANA ISLANDS (SM)	No Response							
COMMONWEALTH, MARIANA ISLANDS (CM)	No Response							
MARYLAND (MD)	14	X	X	X	X	X	X	
MASSACHUSETTS (MA)	9	X		X	X	X		X
MICHIGAN (MI)	3	X		X				
MINNESOTA (MN)	13	X	X	X	X			X
MISSISSIPPI (MS)	4	X	X	X				
MISSOURI (MO)	10		X		X			
MONTANA (MT)	3			X				X
NEBRASKA (NE)	7			X	X			X
NEVADA (NV)	8			X				
NEW HAMPSHIRE (NH)	9	X	X	X	X	X	X	
NEW JERSEY (NJ)	2	X			X			

TABLE 3 (Cont.)

State	Transition Document Categories							
	No. of Doc.	State Coop. Agree.	local Coop. Agree.	State Plans	Trans. Plan. Doc.	Agency Policy Proced.	Indiv. Trans. Plan	Other Trans. Doc.
NEW MEXICO (NM)	2	X			X			
NEW YORK (NY)	6	X		X	X			
NORTH CAROLINA (NC)	1			X				
NORTH DAKOTA (ND)	6	X	X	X	X		X	
OHIO (OH)	9	X		X	X			X
OKLAHOMA (OK)	1				X			
OREGON (OR)	8		X	X		X	X	X
PENNSYLVANIA (PA)	1	X						
PUERTO RICO (PR)	5	X		X	X	X		
RHODE ISLAND (RI)	2	X		X				
SOUTH CAROLINA (SC)	8	X	X	X				X
SOUTH DAKOTA (SD)	3		X	X		X		
TENNESSEE (TN)	8	X	X	X		X		
TEXAS (TX)	Letter Received							
EAST CAROLINE ISLAND (EC)	No Response							
MAJURO, MARSHALL ISLANDS (MM)	No Response							
WESTERN CAROLINE ISLANDS (WC)	No Response							
UTAH (UT)	6			X	X	X	X	X
VERMONT (VT)	9	X	X	X				X
VIRGIN ISLANDS (VI)	2	X				X		
VIRGINIA (VA)	1							X
WASHINGTON (WA)	14	X	X	X	X	X		X
WEST VIRGINIA (WV)	9	X	X		X		X	X
WISCONSIN (WI)	Letter							
WYOMING (WY)	2	X		X				

TABLE 4
Transition Document Content by Categories

	Transition Planning Categories											
State	1 Inter-agenc. Activ.	2 Tran. Data Base	3 Eval. Tran Out-Comes	4 Indiv. Tran. Plan.	5 Staff Prep. For Trans.	6 State Tran. Plan. Organ.	7 Curr. Modif.	8 Serv. Devel.	9 Parent-Family Partic.	10 Changes Regs. Statute. Codes	11 Info. Tran. Serv. Aware.	12 Employ. Involv.
AL	Yes*		Yes	P*	Yes						Yes	
AK	Yes	Yes	Yes	P*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
AS	Yes	Yes		P*							Yes	
AZ	Yes			Yes				Yes	Yes		Yes	
AR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	
CA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
CM*	No Response											
CT	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
DE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
DC	No Response											
EC*	No Response											
FL	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
GA	Yes				Yes							
GJ	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes				Yes		Yes	
HI	Yes	P*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				
ID	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	P*	Yes	Yes
IL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
IA	Yes	Yes				Yes						
IA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
KS	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
KY	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
LA	Yes	Yes		P*						Yes	Yes	Yes
ME	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
MD	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MA	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MI	Yes	Yes		P*				Yes		Yes		Yes

* Yes = Planning Category Represented In Document
** P = Partially Represented
* AS = American Samoa
* CM = Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands
* EC = Eastern Caroline Island

TABLE 4 (Cont.)

State	Transition Planning Categories 1 Inter-agenc. Activ.	2 Tran. Data Base	3 Eval. Tran. Out-Comes	4 Indiv. Tran. Plan	5 Staff Prep. For Trans.	6 State Tran. Plan Organ.	7 Curr. Modif.	8 Serv. Devel.	9 Parent-Family Partic.	10 Changes Regs. Statute. Codes	11 Info. Tran. Serv. Aware.	12 Employ. Involv.
MM*	No Response											
MN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MS	Yes	Yes	Yes	P	Yes			Yes			Yes	Yes
MO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
MT	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	
NE					Yes						Yes	
NV	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes
NH	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes
NJ	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes				
NM	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
NY	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
NC	Yes			P	Yes			Yes			Yes	
ND	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
OH	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
OK	Yes					Yes						
OR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
PA	Yes			P	Yes				Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
PR	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes				Yes
RI	Yes											
SC	Yes	Yes	Yes	P	Yes	Yes			Yes		Yes	Yes
SD	Yes		Yes	P	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
SM*	No Response											
TN	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes			Yes	Yes
TX	Letter											
UT			Yes	Yes	Yes				Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
VT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes			
VI	Yes					Yes		Yes				Yes
VA					Yes		Yes					
WA	Yes	Yes	Yes	P*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WC*	No Response											
WV	Yes	Yes		P*	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
WI	Letter											
WY	Yes	Yes	Yes	P*	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes			

* WC = Western Caroline Island

* MM = Majuro, Marshall Islands

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ballantyne, D., McGee, M., Patton, S., & Cohen, D. (1985). Cooperative programs for transition from school to work (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, Contract #300-83-0158). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Benz, M. R., & Halpern, A. S. (1987). Transition services for secondary students with mild disabilities: A statewide perspective. *Exceptional Children, 53*, 507-514.

Cox, J. L., Frank, N. L., Hocutt, A. M., & Kuligowski, B. A. (1984, October). *A policy-oriented study of special education's service delivery system. Phase I: Preliminary study*. RTI Report Number RTI/2706-06/01FR. Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Halpern, A. (1985). Transition: A look at the foundations. *Exceptional Children, 51*(6), 479-486.

Halpern, A. J. (1986). *Characteristics of a quality program*. Unpublished manuscript. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Halpern, A. S., Close, D. W., & Nelson, D. J. (1986). *On my own: The impact of semi-independent living programs for adults with mental retardation*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Hardman, M., & McDonnell, J. (1987). Implementing federal transition initiatives for youth with severe handicaps: The Utah community-based transition project. *Exceptional Children, 53*(6), 493-499.

Johnson, D. R., Bruininks, R. H., & Thurlow, M. L. (1987). Meeting the challenge of transition service planning through improved interagency cooperation. *Exceptional Children, 53*(6), 522-530.

Kerachsky, S., & Thornton, C. (1987). Findings from the STETS transition employment demonstration. *Exceptional Children, 53*, 555-561.

McDonnell, J. J., Wilcox, B., Boles, S. M., & Bellamy, G. T. (1985). Transition issues facing youth with severe disabilities: Parent's perspective. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 10*(1), 61.

McDonnell, J., Wilcox, B., & Boles, S. M. (1986). Do we know enough to plan for transition? A national survey of state agencies responsible for services to persons with severe handicaps. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 11*, 53-60.

Rusch, F. R., & Phelps, A. L. (1987). Secondary special education and transition from school to work: A national priority. *Exceptional Children, 53*(6), 487-492.

Supported employment: A survey of current activities and issues identified by state vocational rehabilitation agencies in the United States. (1986). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Rehabilitation Services Administration, Region X.

Weatherman, R. F., Stevens, L. M. Krantz, G. C. (1986). *Passages to career: A framework for transition policy for mildly handicapped young adults*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Department of Vocational and Technical Education and Department of Educational Psychology.

Wehman, P. (1981). An analysis and evaluation of the failures of severely disabled individuals in competitive employment. In P. Wehman (Ed.), *Competitive employment: New horizons for severely disabled individuals* (pp. 181-198). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

ARE WE IN DANGER OF MAKING THE SAME MISTAKES WITH ITPs AS WERE MADE WITH IEPs?

Joseph J. Stowitschek and Cheryl A. Kelso

The school-to-work transition movement of the 1980s has been a remarkable demonstration of the marshaling of educational and social forces toward a common cause for youth with disabilities. Bolstered by federal initiatives, many state and local education agencies have launched special efforts to improve transition programming. Individual Transition Plans (ITPs), if developed and used appropriately, show promise to fulfill a critical need as coordinating mechanisms which may work both within and across transitional services. Recent research on ITPs (Stowitschek & Brown, 1987; Stowitschek & Kelso, 1988) indicated that at least half of the state agencies are now urging the use of individual transition plans. On a cautionary note, this research also suggests similar developmental patterns are occurring to those of individual education plans (IEPs), which have been shown to be problematic.

Public law 94-142 (the 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act) mandated the use of IEPs for all students with handicaps. As a result, a transformation has occurred in the manner in which special education services are determined, administered, carried out, and evaluated. IEPs have become the focal point of due process, program monitoring, and educational service. In light of the implications of these sweeping changes, it is amazing that so little research has examined either the quality or the implementation of IEPs. Of the few studies reported, IEPs are apparently not meeting initial expectations in the guidance of instructional efforts. Assessment seems to have little influence on decision making (Welton, 1981; Ysseldyke, Algozine, & Mitchell, 1982) and IEP decisions may have little effect on actual instructional procedures (Carrell, Kayser, Mason, & Haring, 1987).

Individual transition plans seem to be following this same course. There are many articles describing the best format for developing ITPs and what should and should not be included in them, but little is said about how assessment of the student should direct the decision making process and how these decisions should, in turn, guide instruction.

The priorities of special education policymakers and researchers tend to be cyclical (Johnson, Bruininks, & Thurlow, 1987). A priority-directed system permits us to rapidly devote attention to pressing issues. It also urges us to move on to new issues, often before we have adequately addressed the former priorities. Close parallels are evident among issues regarding individual education planning and individual transition planning. If we can acknowledge this cyclical nature in special education priorities, we can learn from earlier experiences, such as with individual education plans, and not repeat the same errors, such as with ITPs. Before mass implementation of ITPs occurs, much more research is needed into the implementation and effects of IEPs, especially those features which parallel the development of ITPs.

The purpose of this article is to examine the problems of individual education plan utilization and compare it to the developing use of individual transition plans. Based on this critique, we recommend policy and procedural changes, as well as research directions, to increase the likelihood of ITPs becoming functional tools in the transition to adult life of youths with handicaps.

Individual Education Plans

Public Law 94-142 (the 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act). Mandated the use of IEPs for all handicapped students. The IEP was designed to be the basis for appropriate services, including the delivery of instruction. As a due process tool, the IEP has served us well. Through the individual education planning process, significant parties, including parents and students with handicaps, have the opportunity to explore the range of appropriate services and determine how they may be provided in the least restrictive educational settings. The effectiveness of service monitoring by federal, state, and local education agencies has also benefited from the IEP as a standard reference point (Morgan, 1981).

Due process notwithstanding, IEPs were also intended to direct the development of quality instruction. The IEP framework was patterned to reflect the elements of individualized systematic instruction--entry-level assessment, long-term goals and specific short-term objectives, services referenced directly to these objectives, and evaluation of the attainment of goals and objectives (Stowitschek, Gable, & Hendrickson, 1980). It is in these functions that the individual education planning process has apparently fallen short of fulfilling initial expectations. The limited research available on the instructional directiveness of IEPs yields information regarding four overlapping areas of concern: (1) relevance and quality, (2) accountability, (3) feasibility, and (4) preparedness.

Relevance and quality. The predominant concern in recent research on IEPs, has been in regard to the content and quality of long-term goals and short-term objectives. Findings of several researchers cast doubt on the functionality and generality of the typical IEP goals and objectives. For instance, Weisenfeld (1987) found that 80% of goals and objectives written for mentally retarded students lacked either contextual or functional relationship to the conditions of ultimate functioning. Others have expressed concerns that many IEP goals are often not related to the students' interactions with their post-school environment, let alone their current environment (Billingsley, 1984; Carrell et al., 1987). It is also rare that IEP goals or objectives address generalization or transfer (Billingsley, 1984; Striefel & Cadez, 1983), a particular problem once students with moderate and severe disabilities begin the transition to adult life. IEP objectives are often not defined by measurable behavior. Alper's (1978) study of 265 IEPs in California schools found technical adequacy to be unsatisfactory. Only 25% of the objectives contained an observable and measurable behavior with specific criteria for mastery.

One of the earliest identified tenets of objectives-based instruction is the principle of appropriate practice (Popham & Baker, 1970). That is, students should be given the opportunity to engage in the behavior specified in the objective. To what extent are instructional activities determined by the objectives of an IEP? Of the few studies reported, IEPs were not meeting the expectations of guiding instructional efforts. Carrell and her associates (Carrell et al., 1987) studied IEP implementation in the secondary special education programs of a large suburban school district. They found that 74% (ranging from 33% to 100%) of classroom activities were related to IEP goals and only 52% (ranging from 17% to 100%) of classroom activities were related to IEP objectives. Of the 13 teachers observed, 2 (15%) were unaware that there were no vocational goals or objectives in their students' IEPs.

Accountability

Although the IEP is intended to serve as a binding contract of services and instruction, the extent to which teachers and schools are held accountable for the attainment of IEP goals and objectives is in dispute. Another problem with the planning process is that parents, although participants, are largely accepting of IEP content and are often encouraged through the treatment they get by school personnel to serve a "rubber stamp" function (Halpern, 1987).

Feasibility. Many of the logistical problems reported in implementing IEPs are due, in part, to a lack of standardization as to how long-term goals, short-term objectives or service activities are to be selected, specified and interpreted. For instance, there is considerable inconsistency in definitions of long- and short-term objectives (Cone, 1987). When such inconsistencies exist, problems result in translating paper directives into classroom activity and the paper does not "work" for the teacher (Mason, 1987). Subsequently, complaints of too much paperwork become commonplace (Halpern, 1985). A directive document, such as an individual education plan, is logistically sound when it is treated as an integral part of the main responsibility (e.g., instruction) and logistically awkward when it is viewed as being peripheral to the main responsibility.

Preparedness. Each of the three problem areas listed above are indicative of an underlying problem. That problem is the apparent lack of training and support for the integration of individual education planning with instructional activities. There is ample evidence that individual planning is associated with sound instruction (Burney & Shores, 1979; Kopp & Stowitschek, 1982; Stowitschek, Lewis, Shores, & Ezell, 1980). It is a contrasting puzzlement that most of us are aware of teachers, even entire school districts, which effectively use IEPs to guide instruction. Why is such guidance atypical rather than typical? Part of the answer lies in the training and support provided. Becoming proficient in individualized instruction and maintaining that proficiency is no simple matter. Sustained teaching proficiency for the typical teacher requires a level of training intensity that is seldom attained. Moreover, it is evident in few teacher training programs (Cavallaro, Stowitschek, George, & Stowitschek, 1980; Shores, Stowitschek, & Kerr, 1978). The maintenance of objectives-based instruction apparently requires considerably more direct support than what is typically available. Rule, Stowitschek, and Innocenti (1988) resorted to weekly teleconferences with teachers in which teachers phoned in to the central offices, results of on-going assessments regarding their students' performance on IEP objectives. Subsequently, supervisors provided telephone feedback based on those results. If there were but one priority to emphasize regarding the improved use of IEPs as an instructional guide, research and development on training and support procedures should be in the forefront.

Characteristics of Individual Transition Plans

Little research is available regarding best practices. However, recommendations regarding the form and function of ITPs abound in the literature. Although there is considerable variation, several features are recommended with a fair amount of uniformity.

Generally, the purposes of individual transition plans are (a) to facilitate entry into and maintenance in adult working and community life situations for students with handicapping conditions, and (b) to coordinate educational and post-secondary community services toward this end (cf. Hardman & McDonnell, 1987). Typically, individual transition plans span a multi-year period, stress the involvement of a transition team of education and adult service providers and are broad in scope, including vocational, residential, leisure, social, and other community living skills. Rather than supplant IEPs, ITPs should be integrated with them (McDonnell, Wilcox, & Boles, 1986; McDonnell & Hardman, 1985), and eventually replace them by the end of a student's secondary education program. Other features, although not as frequently mentioned, are that ITPs should include annual goals and short-term objectives (Hardman & McDonnell, 1987; Wehman, Kregel, & Barcus, 1985), timelines for completion of the activities (Hardman & McDonnell, 1987); Hasazi, Salembir, & Finck, 1983), assessment and evaluation (Hardman & McDonnell, 1987).

Suggestions for the development of ITPs include conducting a person/environment analysis (Schalock, 1986; Wehman, Kregel, Barcus, & Schalock), implementing the ITPs over a pilot period prior to the end of the student's secondary education program (Bates, Suter, & Poelvoorde, 1985; Stodden & Boone, 1987; Wehman, Kregel, Barcus, & Schalock) and determining the agency or person to be responsible for the ITPs (Hardman & McDonnell, 1987; Wehman, Kregel, & Barcus, 1985). As an example, a portion of an ITP is shown in Figure 1 (Wehman, Moon, & McCarthy, 1987).

Potential Problems with ITPS

Individual transition plans are just now being developed in many school districts and there is little or no research base regarding ITPs. However, now is the time to attempt to anticipate and possibly avert problems that could threaten successful implementation of these plans. There are many parallels between the approaches taken with IEPs and ITP development which can provide some useful projections. ITPs also have several features which are unique and go beyond the scope of IEPs.

The shear complexity of what is being attempted in the individual transition plan is intimidating. Representatives of social agencies with radically different modus operandi, funding structures, and service agendas are being brought together with parents and students to plan for an individual's future across a span of several years. Further, this planning occurs at an age when transition for many youths who are without disabilities is uncertain and non-directed. In light of the problems with IEP implementation, it becomes paramount to see that the basic underpinnings of ITPs do not reflect the same shortcomings--relevance and quality, accountability, feasibility, and preparedness.

Relevance and Quality.

The "bottom-up" orientation of educators regarding curriculum development (Wiessenfeld, 1987) could have a restrictive effect on the relevance of ITPs to the needs of students with disabilities once they reach adulthood. Instead of specifying substantive employment, residential, and community outcomes, ITPs could end up containing lists of skills to be developed which might or might not have direct relevance to adult life and might or might not generalize to adult situations. A recently completed analysis of ITP guidelines and sample plans (Stowitschek & Kelso, 1988) suggests this is a real possibility. Because many ITPs are formulated in the later years of secondary education and rely on IEPs to lay the groundwork in the earlier years (Stowitschek & Kelso, 1988), some erroneous assumptions may be made about the level of vocational skills taught. Cobb and Phelps (1983) found few vocational goals specified in IEPs for secondary age students. This finding was underlined by Carrell et al. (1987) who found that few IEP objectives reflected

Figure 1

Sample Employment Goal and Administration Objective
Drawn from an ITP*

INDIVIDUALIZED TRANSITION PLAN

Name: Bob		Age: 16		Date: April 20, 1985

A. Employment Goal:

To become employed in an enclave by May, 1990 (age 20).

Educational Objectives:

1. To receive training in a production job enclave within a local industry with minimal supervision on a daily basis by December, 1985.

Activities	*Person(s) Responsible*
—Locate a job site	Voc. Ed. teacher, Rehab. counselor
—Provide job site training	Sp. Ed teacher, Voc. Ed. teacher
—Provide transportation training	Sp. Ed. teacher
—Assess skills as part of vocational assessment	Voc. Ed. teacher, Sp. Ed. teacher
—Develop behavioral interventions as necessary	School psychologist, Sp. Ed. teacher

Administrative Objectives:

1. To assure the development of a nonprofit organization receiving state, federal, and/or local funds to provide enclave supervision by May, 1989.

Activities	*Person(s) Responsible*
—Meet with community service boards and local rehabilitation agency to discuss the need for enclaves	Sp. Ed. coordinator
—Lobby for funds to be allocated for an enclave	Parent

---

*quoted from: Wehman, P., Moon, M. S., & McCarthy, P. (1987). Transition from school to adulthood for youth with severe handicaps. Focus on Exceptional Children, 18, 1-12.

vocational (7%) or prevocational (8%) subject matter, although employment may be a cornerstone of a productive adult life (Stowitschek & Salzburg, 1987). The maintenance of productivity is interdependent with the conditions under which one lives in the community; under which one recreates, socializes and participates in community activities. The near exclusive focus on employment in transition planning (Halpern, 1985) could lead to an imbalance in the acquisition of skills and support needed to function as and adult.

ITPs currently suffer greatly in technical quality (Stowitschek & Kelso, 1988). Identification of a single coordinating person was the only feature of several recommended in the literature which was consistently represented in the 58 documents submitted from 27 of 56 responding states and territories. Features such as measurable goals and objectives, pilot implementation, employment and community transition outcomes were either infrequently specified or not specified at all in sample ITPs and ITP development guidelines received. For the most part, ITPs contained broad statements rather than specific targets for employment, social, recreational or other functions related to community life.

Accountability. A transition program that is accountable is based on operationally specified outcomes. Failing that, the corresponding links in the accountability chain are severely weakened. Assessment to determine appropriate services or the attainment of transition outcomes is relegated to a "shotgun" approach, if it is done at all. The linkage between vocational assessment and transition planning was not stressed, nor even mentioned in the ITP documents received by Stowitschek and Kelso (1988).

Because ITPs are intended to span the period between schooling and stable adult living, the development of an interaction between education and adult service agencies is crucial. Although many of the ITPs reviewed identified a responsible person and agency, descriptions of how those persons or agencies would interact and contribute to the service effort followed the same patterns laid down in established inter-agency cooperative agreements. A review of state and local cooperative agreements of 43 states conducted by Stowitschek (1987) revealed that the primary actions specified were to meet regularly, provide consultation, and establish a common referral process. In few instances did cooperative agreements indicate more substantive commitments, such as the provision of directs services, the sharing of staff or the allocation of resources. When cooperative agreements are extensive, long-standing, and updated frequently, they apparently have little impact. Cuenin (1985) reviewed activities of local service agencies regarding their cooperative agreements and found that little actual activity corresponded to the activities identified in cooperative agreements. As a contractual arrangement, ITPs must be specific about services to be provided across agencies, relying more on the commitment of local representatives to the individual than on general interagency cooperative arrangements. In the Wehman et al. (1986) sample ITP, transition goals and objectives are paired with administrative objectives (Figure 1) to enhance the crossagency linkage. The plan should include specifications, not only of how the transition goal attainment will be measured but how the administrative goal attainment will be monitored.

Feasibility. The complexity of individual transition planning alone is reason enough to speak for the need to conduct formative evaluation and revision of ITPs. Because they are intended to span a period of several years, the conditions which shape ITPs will change: the skills of the client, business conditions, service representatives, residential status, etc. Thus, the ITP should "evolve" (Bates, Suter, & Poelvoorde, 1985) over the course of the student's secondary educational experience. The employment, home, and community-living service components should be tested and adjusted in preparation for full implementation. A formative evaluation and revision process will help to ensure that evolution of the ITP occurs systematically; so that it closely reflects the realities of employment, home, and community-living prospects for a particular student.

The feasibility of transfer between school and adult services should also be a focus of concern. Edgar (1988) writes of the "handoff" as being critical but often not predetermined. Transition specialists agree that a service agency should be identified (Bates et al., 1985; McDonnell & Hardman, 1985; Brody-Hasazi, Salembir, & Finck, 1983; Wehman & Moon, 1985), but differ as to where the transfer responsibility lies and how it should occur--special education, vocational rehabilitation or the potential receiving agency (e.g., community college). The problem with each of these options is that the workscope of no single agency spans both youth and adulthood for a sufficient duration. The family is the only group with a "vested interest" in the disabled individual across both childhood and adulthood. Although most experts on transition stress the importance of involving family members in the ITP process (Brody-Hasazi et al., 1983; McDonnell & Hardman, 1985; Schalock, 1986; Stodden & Boone, 1987; Wehman, Kregel, & Barcus, 1985; Wehman & Moon, 1985), the potential of parents as mediators is rarely mentioned. The capacities of parents and family members to serve in transition roles beyond planning should be capitalized upon. After all, family involvement is one of the factors most consistently cited relative to the employment success of persons with disabilities (Hasazi, Gordon, & Roe, 1985; Schalock, 1986). From the standpoint of feasibility, it makes sense that the persons who are most knowledgeable of a person with disabilities and are natural advocates would be in better positions to mediate the transition process than any single agency. These agencies are often restricted by age mandates, such as is the public education system, or by limitations of entitlement, such as is the case with developmental disabilities services.

Preparedness. Regardless of the specificity and quality of the ITPs, the extent of commitment of participants, or the means by which practical transition plans are evolved, the underlying problem still pertains to the extent to which the participants are prepared to carry out that which is planned. The preparation of teachers, adult service providers and parents has serious flaws, each of a different nature.

Both the orientation and training of secondary special educators and vocational educators present hindrances to the successful transition to adult life of youth with disabilities. Several authors have suggested the predominant orientation of secondary special educators is toward academic preparation of students rather than vocational, home or community living preparation (Brown, Halpern, Hasazi, & Wehman, 1987; Clark, 1984; Knowlton & Clark, 1987) and this orientation corresponds with their previous training. In a survey of early work experiences of high schoolers with disabilities, Stowitschek (1987) found indications that nearly two-thirds of the special education and resource teachers not now involved in community-based transition training would be unwilling to become involved if given the opportunity and approval by their supervisors. Prior to the recent transition initiative, the typical special education teacher preparation program offered one or fewer courses devoted solely to vocational education or school-to-work transition (Salzberg, 1985). Some programs had a career education emphasis, but many did not. Numerous short-term workshops and conferences characterized the special education personnel development efforts following the onset of the transition initiatives. Substantive development of preservice training in transition is now just beginning to occur. Knowlton and Clark (1987) suggest that a major role redefinition of secondary special educators is required in order to reorient and prepare them to promote transition goals of youth with disabilities. Brown (Brody-Hasazi et al., 1987) believes that special educators must be trained as genericists, able to provide academic, self-help and employment-related instruction. Regardless of the approach advocated, transition specialists are in accord that considerably more time and effort must be invested toward preparation teachers to carry out transition plans than what has been done in the past.

The increased emphasis of adult service providers on community employment training of persons with disabilities has brought with it a recognition of the limited training of job developers, job coaches and other rehabilitation workers. Unlike education, there are no minimum standards or formal training programs for staff of shelter workshops, work activity centers, employment training programs or other rehabilitation facilities in most states. Vocational rehabilitation programs provide university training in rehabilitation but it is primarily directed at evaluation, counseling, and prosthesis at the graduate level. Few rehabilitation facilities or employment training programs can afford direct-line staff with masters degrees and many must staff their programs with persons with little training beyond a high school education (Williams &

Stowitschek, 1987). It is not uncommon to find a person with a high school education or a degree in business administration to be expected to do, in a matter of weeks, what special education teachers spend years in training to learn to do (e.g., task analysis, criterion-referenced measurement, systematic instructional presentation including successive approximation, and systematic fading and redirection of instruction). Part of the problem is the financing of such programs, but another part of the problem is the lack of formal training at the pregraduate level (Karan & Knight, 1986). Karan and his associates (Karan et al., 1986) have developed a personnel preparation program based at a university-affiliated facility which prepares independent living specialists who earn an associate of arts degree from a local community college. Similar programs for rehabilitation specialists could supply affordable staff for rehabilitation programs, yet upgrade the status and background of front-line persons who must carry out the adult service side of the ITPs.

The ability of parents to assist their children in the transition process is affected by insufficiencies regarding their orientation and knowledge. As with many special education teachers, they are oriented toward expecting a heavy academic education for their handicapped son or daughter while in high school (Halpern, 1985). Prior to the development of an ITP, a concentrated effort on the part of school personnel should be made to see that parents compare their child's skills and ability to the demands of adult life and develop realistic expectations for them. For some, the academic emphasis may be realistic, while for others employment and independent living skill training may be the best application of secondary education services. Regardless, parents should come to the realization that vocational preparation is an essential component of their child's preparation for transition adult life. Many families are in the best position to assist in the development of employment for youth with disabilities. For instance, the friends and relatives network has been shown to be a powerful job development tool (Hasazi et al., 1985; Mithaug, Horiuchi, & Fanning, 1985). However, if improperly developed, jobs gained in this manner can also be lost. Parents should be made privy to job development, negotiation, and decision-making techniques as partners in the ITP service plan. Families can also be of assistance in the maintenance of employment for their disabled relatives, for they may be best able to influence off-job contingencies necessary to maintain those persons in employment. When they are willing and able, parents should be prepared to be active participants in transition programming as employment advocates, developers, and maintainers.

Conclusions

Public Law 94-142 and individual education planning have had a phenomenal impact on the access of children with disabilities to educational services and to the mainstream of education. Unfortunately, the expectations that IEPs would guide the implementation of systematic instruction have been, at best, only partially fulfilled, particularly with regard to secondary education.

Individual transition plans, although complex to implement, could provide a functional bridge between school and adult life. Judging by the initial patterns of development, they too are in danger of being used similarly to how IEPs have been used. If these problems are not recognized and addressed with concerted effort, ITPs may be relegated to the status of perfunctory paperwork.

When plans are overly general, corresponding activities may reflect a lack of focus. Subsequent outcomes, if any, may not be recognizable relative to the initial intent of the plans. Moreover, when planning stops short at the preparation of detailed specifications, without the arrangement of appropriate commitments or the preparation of participants to fulfill those commitments, desirable outcomes may be clearly recognizable, yet unattainable. As we strive to promote the development of individual transition planning and subsequent programming, we must resist the urge to focus on the mechanics and keep ever in view the aim of producing for individuals with disabilities the most rewarding participation possible in working and community life.

REFERENCES

Alper, T. G. (1978). Individual education plans: How well do they work? Hayward: California State University, Department of Educational Psychology and Sacramento: California State Department of Education.

Burney, J. D., & Shores, R. E. (1979). A study of relationships between instructional planning and pupil behavior. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, *2*(3), 16-25.

Bates, P., Suter, C., & Poelvoorde, R. M. (1985). *Illinois transition project: Transition plan development for special education students in Illinois public schools*. Springfield, IL: Governor's Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities.

Billingsley, F. F. (1984). Where are the generalized outcomes? (An examination of instructional objectives). *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, *9*, 186-192.

Brody-Hasazi, S., Salembir, G., & Finck, K. (1983). Directions for the 80s: Vocational preparation for secondary mildly handicapped students. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *Summer*, 206-209.

Brown, L., Halpern, A. S., Hasazi, S. B., & Wehman, P. (987). From school to adult living: A forum on issues and trends. *Exceptional Children*, *53*, 546-554.

Carrell, H. D., Kayser, J., Mason, C., & Haring, N. (1987). The concurrence between IEPs and classroom activities. Unpublished manuscript. University of Washington, Seattle.

Carrell, H. D., Mason, C. Y., Billingsley, F., Kayser, J., & Haring, N. (1987). Do IEPs support transition? Unpublished manuscript. University of Washington, Seattle.

Cavallaro, C., Stowitschek, C., George, M., & Stowitschek, J. (1980). Intensive inservice teacher education and concomitant changes in handicapped learners. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *3*(3), 49-57.

Clark, G. M. (1984). Issues in teacher education for secondary special education: Time for hindsight and foresight. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *7*, 170-176.

Cobb, R. B., & Phelps, L. A. (1983). Analyzing individual education programs for vocational components: An exploratory study. *Exceptional Children*, *50*, 62-63.

Cone, J. D. (1987). Intervention planning using adaptive behavior instruments. *The Journal of Special Education*, *21* 127-148.

Cuenin, L. H. (1985). The impact of cooperative agreements on the coordination of vocational education services for the handicapped (Doctoral Disseration, University of Maryland). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *47*, DA864217.

Edgar, G. (1988). Transition from school to community. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 73-75.

Halpern, A. (1985). Transition: A look at the foundations. *Exceptional Children*, *51*, 479-486.

Halpern, A. S. (1987). Characteristics of a quality program. Unpublished manuscript.

Hardman, M., & McDonnell, J. (1987). Implementing federal transition initiatives for youths with severe handicaps: The Utah Community-Based Transition Project. *Exceptional Children*, *53*, 493-498.

Hasazi, S., Gordon, L., & Roe, C. (1985). Factors associated with the employment status of handicapped youth exiting high school from 1979 to 1983. *Exceptional Children*, *51*, 455-469.

Hasazi, S., Salembir, G., & Finck, K. (1983). Directions for the 80s: Vocational preparation for secondary mildly handicapped students. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, *Summer*, 206-209.

Johnson, D. R., Bruininks, R. H., & Thurlow, M. L. (1987). Meeting the challenge of transition service planning through improved interagency cooperation. *Exceptional Children*, *53*, 522-530.

Karan, O. C., Brandenberg, S., Sauer, M., Yoder, D. E., Mathy-Laiko, P., Villarruel, F., & Dolan, T. R. (1986). Maximizing independence for persons who are developmentally disabled: Community-based programs at the Waisman Center University Affiliated Facility. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, *11*, 286-293.

Karan, O. C., & Knight, C. B. (1986). Training and staff development issues in developmental disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, *7*, 40-45.

Knowlton, H. E., & Clark, G. M. (1987). Transition issues for the 1990s. *Exceptional Children*, *53*, 562-563.

Kopp, K., & Stowitschek, J. (1982). Effects of teacher's daily individual education planning, with and without error analysis, on mathematics computation skills. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *5*(4), 43-50.

Mason, C. (1987). Transition, IEPs, and the next steps. Unpublished paper, University of Washington, Seattle.

McDonnell, J, & Hardman, M. (1985). Planning the transition of severely handicapped youth from school to adult services: A framework for high school programs. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 20, 275-286.

McDonnell, J., Wilcox, B., & Boles, S. M. (1986). Do we know enough to plan for transition? A national survey of state agencies responsible for services to persons with severe handicaps. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 11, 53-60.

Mithaug, D. E., Horiuchi, C. N., & Fanning, P. N. (1985). A report on the Colorado statewide follow-up survey of special education students. Exceptional Children, 51, 397-404.

Morgan, D. (1981). Preparing individualized education plans: A primer. Reston, VA: CEC Publictions.

Popham, J., & Baker, E. (1970). Systematic instruction. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rule, S., Stowitschek, J., & Innocenti, M. (1988). Daycare for handicapped children: Can we stimulate mainstream service through a daycare special education merger? Child Care Quarterly.

Salzberg, C. L. (1985). Personal communication.

Schalock, R. L. (1986). Service delivery coordination. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), Competitive employment issues and strategies. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Shores, R. E., Stowitschek, J., & Kerr, M. M. (1978). Final Report: Field-based special education teacher training program. U. S. Office of Education, Grant Number GOD7500475.

Stodden, R. A., & Boone, R. (1987). Assessing transition services for handicapped youth: A cooperative interagency approach. Exceptional Children, 53, 537-545.

Stowitschek, C. E., Lewis, B. L., Shores, R. E., & Ezell, D. L. (1980). Procedure for analyzing student performance data to generate hypotheses for the purpose of educational decision making. Behavioral Disorders, 5, 136-149.

Stowitschek, J. (1987). Administrator's perceptions of early work experiences and transition programming. Institute for Transition Research on Problems of Handicapped Youth: Second Annual Report (William J. Schill, Principal Investigator), University of Washington, Seattle.

Stowitschek, J., & Brown, D. (1987). Transition planning methods and progress: A national study. Institute for Transition Research on Problems of Handicapped Youth: Second Annual Report (William J. Schill, Principal Investigator), University of Washington, Seattle.

Stowitschek, J., Gable, R., & Hendrickson, J. M. (1980). *Instructional materials for exceptional children: Selection, adaptation, and evaluation*. Germantown, MD: Aspen Systems.

Stowitschek, J., & Kelso, C. A. (1988). Analysis of individual transition planning documents and guidelines. Institute for Transition Research on Problems of Handicapped Youth: Second Annual Report (William J. Schill, Principal Investigator), University of Washington, Seattle.

Stowitschek, J., & Salzberg, C. (1987). *Job success for handicapped youth: A social protocol curriculum*. Reston, VA: CEC Publications.

Striefel, S., & Cadez, M. J. (1983). Developing, implementing, and evaluating functional individualized education programs. In S. Striefel and M. J. Cadez (Eds.), *Serving children and adolescents with developmental disabilities in the special education classroom* (pp. 75-111). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Wehman, P., Kregel, J., & Barcus, J. M. (1985). From school to work: A vocational transition model for handicapped students. *Exceptional Children*, *52*, 25-37.

Wehman, P. H., Kregel, J., Barcus, J. M., & Schalock, R. L. (1986). Vocational transition for students with developmental disabilities. In W. E. Kiernan & J. A. Stark (Eds.), *Pathways to employment for adults with developmental disabilities*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Wehman, P., & Moon, M. S. (1985). Critical values in employment programs for persons with developmental disabilities. In P. Wehman & J. Hill (Eds.), *Competitive employment for persons with mental retardation (Vol. 1).* Richmond, VA: Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, School of Education, Virginia Commonwealth University.

Wehman, P., Moon, M. S., & McCarthy, P. (1986). Transition from school to adulthood for youth with severe handicaps. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, *18*(5), 1-12.

Weisenfeld, R. B. (1987). Functionality in the IEPs of children with Down's Syndrome. *Mental Retardation*, *25*, 281-286.

Welton, J. (1981). Individualized educational program evaluation model: Development and field study. San Jose, CA: Santa Clara County Superintendent of Schools/California State Department of Education, Sacramento Division of Special Education.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Algozine, B., & Mitchell, J. (1982). Special education team decision making: An analysis of current practice. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60(50), 308-313.

WASHINGTON JOB DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES SURVEY

Joseph J. Stowitschek and Robert Williams

The concepts that work is important and has private as well as public value are generally accepted without argument. Work contributes to one's self-esteem and feelings of independence and worth. According to Brickey and Campbell (1981), "Feelings of accomplishment, being normal, independence, and the accompanying changes in self-concepts apparently [are] important motivating factors in the employees choosing to stay with the job rather than return to the workshop" (p. 116). Being financially independent means that the public need not subsidize an individual's existence. Some people are capable of preparing for, finding and securing, and maintaining jobs with no public or other external assistance. However, many people need varying degrees of support to prepare for, find and secure, and maintain their jobs. The primary goal in all situations is for people to be able to work and support themselves to the greatest extent possible.

Those individuals who are developmentally disabled are also those who need assistance in order to obtain and maintain work for themselves. In recent years, disabled individuals have demonstrated that they are capable of productive employment. Bellamy, Rhodes, Bourbeau, and Mank (1982) assert, "The employment potential of mentally retarded adults, even those with severe handicaps, is no longer in doubt. Difficult work skills and significant productivity have been documented across diverse work environments" (p. 26).

Success of a variety of programs for disabled workers has been documented by Jacobs (1978), Brickey and Campbell (1981), Brown et al. (1984), and Rhodes and Valenta (1985). Though the clients, the situations, and the programs differ considerably, the constant is that they have all demonstrated that disabled people are capable of productive, meaningful work.

The existing model of job development is a flow-through system. People enter workshops or day programs, learn basic skills and behavior, and move into work outside the workshop. Two readily identifiable problems exist. The first problem is that not everyone is served according to the tenets of the system. Only the more capable and better functioning follow the flow-through pattern. The rest simply remain. This realization is supported by several studies: Appell, Williams, and Fishell (1962; 1964-65) found that: (a) those who successfully moved from a training center to competitive employment spent significantly less time in the center than did those who did not move into competitive employment situations and (b) those who were successful in employment (employed on the job for six months or longer) had spent less time in the training center than those who were unsuccessful in employment (discharged from the job within six months). Similarly, Bellamy, Rhodes, Bourbeau, and Mank (1982) found that one-third of those who move into competitive employment do so within three months of entering a workshop, 75% do so within one year, and the likelihood of placement in competitive employment after two years is only 3%. Finally, Rhodes and Valenta (1985) assert that most of those who are labeled severely handicapped remain unemployed in segregated institutions, activity programs, and work activity centers. The second problem is that what is learned in the workshops and day activity centers may not be transferable to future employment. People who are initially capable of moving into competitive employment do so. Those who are initially incapable remain. Bellamy, Rhodes, and Albin (1986) assert that, for those with severe disabilities, skills and behaviors acquired in conventional settings will not necessarily transfer to later employment preparation and work. If this is so, the workshop merely acts as a screening device for those who are, a priori, capable of working in competitive employment situations.

Brown et al. (1983) argue that severely handicapped people acquire fewer and less complex skills than their non-handicapped peers and that the skills they are taught should be of direct relevance to functioning effectively in their environments. Vogelsberg (1986) contends that instruction should be community based and should occur at the public school level. If integration in the workforce is the objective, then integration in the community ought to begin in school. Brown et al. (1983) maintain that, in the best interests of students, their families, and the public, severely handicapped students ought to attend schools close to home and with their peers. The argument is that students ought to be helped to live with their peers and in their communities, not just prepared to do so. Similarly, adults need to be helped to work with their peers and in their communities, not just prepared to do so.

Supported employment is an attempt to help disabled people work with their peers and in their communities and an alternative to the existing flow-through arrangement. The idea of supported employment accepts that some people need a greater degree of support to prepare for, find and secure, and maintain their jobs. Rhodes and Valenta (1985) accept the limitations of sheltered workshop services, acknowledges the opportunity and benefits offered by unsupported competitive employment, but maintains that unsupported competitive employment is inappropriate for those who are not able to compete with non-handicapped workers.

The Federal Register (May 27, 1987) defines supported employment as "competitive work in an integrated setting for individuals who, because of their handicaps, need on-going support services to perform that work." Mank, Rhodes, and Bellamy (1985) describe four models of supported work: (1) the Supported Jobs Model, in which support as needed is provided for an individual to learn and perform work in a regular job in the community and with non-handicapped peers; (2) the Enclave Model, in which a group of disabled individuals, trained and supervised, work together but within a business or industry in the community; (3) the Mobile Crew Model, which is a small, single purpose, mobile business and which places a group of individuals in the community to work; and (4) the Benchwork Model, which provides employment in electronics assembly work in a service agency that also functions as a business enterprise.

Hill et al. (1987) performed a benefit-cost analysis of supported employment and concluded that, for the taxpayer/government, for every $1.00 expended, $1.87 was accumulated in benefits and, for the working disabled person, for every $1.00 relinquished, $1.97 was received in increased income. Thus, not only is supported employment a way to integrate disabled people in the community, to offer people who, otherwise, might not have the opportunity to work in an integrated environment, and to avoid the possibility of endless preparation, but supported employment also allows both the individuals, who, by earning wages, can spend money and pay taxes, and the government/taxpayer, who no longer has to pay for the workshop or day activity center care and receives taxes, to benefit.

Depending upon the degree of severity of the disability and upon prior experience and preparation, varying degrees of preparation, assistance, and on-going support are necessary in order that disabled people secure and maintain employment. Moreover, even though we know that (a) employment has individual and societal benefits, (b) the flow-through system has not prepared for or provided adequate employment for severely disabled people, and (c) supported employment is a viable alternative to the flow-through system, the problem remains that we know very little about how jobs for severely disabled people are developed, what the people who find or create these jobs do to prepare for them, and, consequently, what is or is not known about the process of job development. To date, what has been observed and discussed amounts to isolated pieces of the job development puzzle. The various pieces can be categorized into five general groups: (1) recognition of need and calls for collaboration; (2) follow-up studies; (3) employer attitude studies; (4) job acquisition and maintenance factors; and (5) general guidelines for job development.

1. Needs have been recognized, and collaboration and commitments have been encouraged. The National Association of State Directors of Special Education (1985) recommended (a) the need to develop marketing strategies directed to and including employers and business groups, unions, service providers, and parents, (b) the need for service providers to develop a marketing approach, using business terminology and language, to demonstrate that people with disabilities can help business by being reliable, loyal workers who can perform specific assignments on the jobs, and (c) the need for schools to teach job-related behaviors rather than specific job skills which can be learned on the job. The National Alliance of Business (1986) encouraged the cooperation of business and government to develop policies that can contend with the changing economic environment.

2. Follow-up studies assessed the preparation for work as well as the current working status of disabled people. Tarr and Lewis (1977) found that, for their sample of handicapped graduates of vocational education institutions, vocational training was related to the first full-time job in about half the cases and academic training was related to the first full-time job in only about 40% of the cases. Hawkins (1984) found that only 47% of a sample of special education graduates were working full- or part-time and only 80% of the employers of those graduates were satisfied with the graduates as employees. Hasazi, Gordon, and Roe (1985) found that only 21% of the sample of mentally retarded people were employed full-time and utilization of the self-family-friend network accounted for 61% of the jobs. Wehman, Kregel, and Seyfarth (1985) found that 78.6% of the sample of mentally retarded youth were unemployed and only 12% were employed full- or part-time.

3. Employer attitudes have been discussed and researched. Cohen (1967) found a positive relation between schooling and realistic concept of mental retardation and a negative relation between schooling and attitude toward hiring and concluded that the acquisition of information does not assure an accepting attitude toward employment of mentally retarded people. Burrow (1967) interviewed 350 potential employers and concluded that a step-by-step plan should be developed jointly by the job developer, the client, and the employer. Emener and McHargue (1978) surveyed employers and concluded that employers must be educated and need to be reassured that a disabled employee who needs support will not be abandoned by the placement counselor. Gruenhagen (1982) surveyed fast food restaurant managers and found a significant correlation between prior experience and attitudes toward hiring disabled workers. Shafer, Hill, Seyfarth, and Wehman (1987) surveyed 483 direct supervisors of mentally retarded workers and concluded that (a) employers may be willing to allow for less than desired performance in exchange for reliable attendance and low turnover and (b) supported competitive employment services enhance the employment, retention, and perceived competence of the mentally retarded workers.

4. Factors relevant to successful job acquisition and maintenance have been identified. Mithaug (1979) found that ability to perform the job and job productivity were the two most influential factors that affect a company's decision to hire a disabled person. Greenspan and Shoultz (1981) cited social more so than non-social factors as reasons why mentally retarded people lose jobs, an observation that should be taken into consideration when preparing disabled people for working situations. Similarly, Wehman (1975) proposed a curriculum of social skills (personal care, primary interaction, job and community survival, and advanced interaction) necessary for successful vocational adjustment. Brickey, Browning, and Campbell (1982) identified a structured position which includes a detailed job description closely followed by employees as a significant variable relating to successful job maintenance.

Ford, Dineen, and Hall (1984) cited the need for follow-up and support to strengthen the possibility of successful job maintenance.

5. General guidelines for those who develop jobs have been presented. Payne and Chaffin (1968) advocated (a) being honest in describing the disabling condition, (b) involving the employer in the training, (c) selling the employer a program, not a product, (d) leading the program with a good worker, (e) reinforcing the employer's interest by reporting improvements, and (f) giving the employer support for involvement. Salamone (1971) argued for a client-centered approach based upon client responsibility and counselor direction. Ugland (1977) described Job Seeker's Aids, a procedure which utilizes industry lists, industry maps, a job seeker's guide, and a feedback system. Minton (1977) made practical suggestions regarding job placement strategies, such as (a) the client must be job ready, (b) job development receives the least attention from counselors, (c) placement should be based upon job analysis, and (d) the employer must be assured of the counselor's support of the client after the client is placed on the job. Mithaug, Hagmeier, and Haring (1977) developed a system for evaluating client progress toward objectives that relate to job placement and recommend developing a programmatic relationship between work specifications of a particular job and the training activities developed for a prospective client. Wehman, Hill, and Koehler (1979) discussed the limitations of sheltered workshops and factors to consider in job selection, such as (a) the client's previous work history; (b) the client's functioning level and physical characteristics; (c) the client's SSI situation; (d) the client's living situation and transportation needs; and (e) client and parent attitudes. Rusch and Schutz (1979) recommended and described a three part behavior analytic training approach, which focuses on (a) surveying the community to determine the requirements for occupational survival; (b) training the individual for occupational survival; and (c) placing the individual in a community job. Wehman and Kregel (1985) advocated, among other policy changes, that personnel in community service programs must receive extensive training in job placement, job-site behavioral training, and follow-up strategies. Finally, Parent and Everson (1986), in a review of business literature, inferred suggestions for (a) increasing the number of competitively employed individuals with disabilities and (b) insuring a smooth transition from rehabilitation services to meaningful employment opportunities.

These discussions, observations, and findings are helpful. Nevertheless, the individual job developer has to incorporate the goals and recommendations, the empirically based findings and common sense advice, a personal network of business prospects and an organization's business relationships, an ability to work with people and a knowledge of systems, then devise a plan of attack on the business community, with the degree of systematic approach dependent upon the job developer's personal abilities and organizational support. The problem is that we do not know enough about what job developers do, how they spend their time, how they think they should spend their time, what strategies they have when they attempt to develop relationships with the business community and find jobs for their clients, and how they go about pursuing their goals.

Job development prospects and practices are at the core of a larger issue on supported employment which relates to the shaping of long-term policies regarding how it will fit into the spectrum of services for persons with disabilities. The issue pertains to the exact extent and nature of the "market" for supported employment. Some examples of market-related questions are: (a) is supported employment appropriate for all, or even most moderately-severely disabled persons?; and (b) what is the best means of tapping and utilizing the available market? Knowledge of how job developers are currently coping with these questions would be useful to help formulate subsequent research approaches.

Developmentally disabled people have increasingly demonstrated their ability to be employed successfully in supported work situations. However, the question of the extent and receptiveness of the market for supported employment is still unresolved. In their exploration of that market, job developers need to be directed toward those situations that are potentially the most viable. Toward that end, three important questions to be answered are: (1) What are the critical factors that comprise the job development and acquisition process? (2) What are the reasons that job developers use to persuade prospective employers to consider accommodating supported work programs? And (3) are those factors and/or reasons potentially the most productive?

Purpose And Objectives

The purpose of the project was to survey directors and job developers of rehabilitation programs serving developmentally disabled people in the state of Washington in the first study, and possibly other states in later studies, and obtain information regarding both perceptions and practices in their efforts to place developmentally disabled people in supported work situations.

The objectives were: (1) to identify the kinds of clients being served by the job developers; (2) to identify the kinds of working situations in which the clients are placed; (3) to determine the extent of experience and success job developers have had in the areas of competitive employment, job coach placements, enclaves, mobile crews, and other types of employment; (4) to identify the strategies used by job developers in job development and acquisition; (5) to identify the characteristics of the companies in which the job developers attempt to place their clients; and (6) to enumerate and evaluate the persuasive strength of the reasons the job developers present to potential employers in attempting to persuade them to consider supported work placements.

Population and Sample

The study population was comprised of the directors and job developers (one per agency) of agencies identified as competitive and/or supported employment service providers by Rehabilitation Enterprises of Washington (REW) and who serve clients eligible for funding by The State Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) or The State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation's Extended Sheltered Employment Program (ESE), whether funded by DDD, ESE, or other funding source. The sample consisted of those REW service providers who were willing to participate in the study.

Job developers were defined as employees of the participating service agencies and currently involved in competitive and/or supported job placement of developmentally disabled people (according to Washington State Division of Developmental Disabilities eligibility criteria) in work settings outside of sheltered workshops and/or day activity centers. The work settings were those in which the primary purpose was not the creation of work for handicapped employees.

Instrument

The questionnaire was developed after discussions and interviews occurred with people who are knowledgeable about job development for developmentally disabled people and about supported employment and who are involved in both private organizations and public agencies. Feedback on the original drafts was obtained from people in the field of supported employment development, and revisions were made accordingly. Though the questionnaire asked for some detailed information regarding clients and costs, knowledge of such information by organization and agency directors was considered a reasonable expectation. (See Tables 1-8 for illustrations of question-reponse categories).

Procedure

Directors and job developers of agencies promoting job development were mailed questionnaires that assess the situational factors in which job developers work, the clients they serve, the strategies they use when they approach prospective employers, and the reasons they utilize to attempt to persuade prospective employers to accept their clients. Specifically, they were asked, for example: (1) to identify their clients by funding sources and to quantify their population; (2) to identify the work situations in which their clients have been placed; (3) how much time they are able to devote to job development and how long they have been attempting to create job placements; (4) how many clients have been placed in job situations, how many hours per week the clients work, and what their hourly pay is; (5) how the respondents have developed job placements, what tactics they have used, what reasons they have presented to potential employers to consider hiring their clients; and (6) what problems they have encountered and whether or not they have been able to resolve them. The questionnaires were mailed, and follow-up calls were made, if necessary, to encourage return of the questionnaires.

Results

A total of 138 questionnaires were sent to directors and job developers of organizations and agencies that serve disabled clients. Of the original 138, based upon information received from Rehabilitation Enterprises of Washington after the initial mailing, 68 organizations or agencies were identified as most likely to serve developmentally disabled clients. The 68 organizations were then pursued through follow-up phone calls and, if necessary, second and third mailings to encourage their responses. Responses from the remaining 70 organizations were not pursued, because the more recent information available indicted that they were not serving the client population of interest in this study. Consequently, the 138 includes organizations that should not have been considered in the original population, but since all 138 organization were mailed the original questionnaire, the number 138 is used in the determination of the final response rate.

Of the 68 designated organizations, responses were received from 39 organizations (57.35%); and 37 (54.41%) were considered valid cases. Additionally, 14 responses were received from organizations not identified as most likely to serve developmentally disabled clients, of which nine were valid responses. In total, 53 of 138 organizations responded for a response rate of 38.41%; and, in total, 46 of 138 (33.33%) were accepted as valid cases.

Agency or organization directors comprised 84.4% of the respondents; job developers comprised 13.3%; and others comprised 2.2%. Organizations that provide employment training and placement services as their sole responsibility comprised 29.9% of the responses; organizations that provide facility based employment and work training services comprised 52.3%; and other organizations comprised 18.2%. The responding organizations or agencies represented 1387 (M = 32.26) clients who were DDD (Division of Developmentally Disabled) eligible and DDD sponsored, 119 (M = 4.96) clients who were DDD eligible and ESE (Extended Sheltered Employment) sponsored, and 272 (M = 10.46) clients who were not DDD eligible and were DVR (Division of Vocational Rehabilitation) sponsored.

A preliminary view of the working relationship between a job developer and an employer considers the pattern that develops from the job developer's initial contact with an employer to an employer's receptive reaction to an employer's actual hiring of the job developer's client. Table 1 depicts features of this relationship.

Overall, 6299 employers were estimated to have been contacted. Of that total, 1905 (30.24%) were deemed receptive, and 1091 (17.32% of the total) reportedly hired the clients of the job developers. Specifically for Competitive Employment, 1852 employers were contacted; 1068 (57.67%) were considered receptive to hiring disabled workers; and 559 (30.18%) actually hired disabled workers. Specifically, for Job Coach employment, 2008 employers were contacted; 211 (10.51%) were considered receptive; and 256 (12.75%) actually hired. For Enclave situations, 66 employers were contacted; 17 (25.76%) were considered receptive; and 12 (18.18%) actually hired. For Mobile Crew situations, 311 employers were contacted; 281 (90.35%) were considered receptive; and 163 (41.84%) actually hired.

Tables 2 and 3 depict the mean number of placement sites per placing organization and the mean number of working clients per placing organization. The Competitive Employment category shows that Original Sites at which clients have worked six months or more (M = 5.92) and Improved Sites at which clients have worked six months or more (M = 6.00) both exceed the number of Discontinued Sites (M = 4.50). Furthermore, the number of clients who have worked at the Original Sites for six months or more (M = 7.36) exceeds the number of clients who are not working at Improved or Original Sites (M = 6.07). The number of clients who are working at Improved Sites (M = 3.50) is fewer than the number of clients working at the Original Sites or of those not working at the Improved or Original Sites; nevertheless, (a) the range between the means is not nearly as dramatic as the range in the Job Coach category, and (b) the numbers may be representative of a fluctuation that occurs as people progress through the pattern.

In the Job Coach category, the Discontinued Sites (M = 26.00) exceeds Original Sites at which clients have worked six months or more (M = 11.50) or less than six months (M = 2.80) and Improved Sites at which clients have worked six months or more (M = 16.50) or less than six months (M = 3.67). Similarly, the number of clients not working at Improved or Original Sites (M = 20.25) exceeds the number of clients working at Original Sites six months or more (M = 8.50) or less than six months (M = 3.00) as well as of clients working at Improved Sites six months or more (M = 19.00) or less than six months (M = 5.00).

In both the Enclave and Mobile Crew categories, the number of Original Sites at which clients have worked (M = 3.00 and M = 11.33 respectively) as well as the number of clients who have worked at Original Sites (M = 12.00 and M = 9.55 respectively) exceed the number of Discontinued Sites (M = 1.00 and M = 5.23 respectively) and the number of clients not working at Improved or Original Sites (M = 4.00 and M = 4.00 respectively).

Table 1

Comparison of Employers Contacted, Employers Receptive to the Possibility of Hiring Disabled Workers, and Employers Actually Willing to Hire Disabled Workers.

	Competitive Employment	Job Coach	Enclave	Mobile Crew	Other Employ.	Any Employ.	Total
Contacted Employers	1852	2008	66	392	311	1670	6299
M =	115.75	223.11	8.25	30.15	103.67	417.50	203.19
% =	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Receptive Employers	1068	211	17	273	281	55	1905
M =	76.27	30.14	2.43	24.82	93.67	27.50	79.38
% = *	57.67%	10.51%	25.76%	69.64%	90.35%	03.29%	30.24%
Hiring Employers	559	256	12	164	1		992
M =	29.42	32.00	1.33	12.62	1.00	**	32.00
% = *	30.18%	12.75%	18.18%	41.84%	0.00%		15.75%

* Percentages are of the total number of employers contacted (100.00%).
** This question was not asked.

Table 2

Job Site Patterns: Mean Number of Placement Sites Per Placing Organization

	Competitive Employment	Job Coach	Enclave	Mobile Crew	Other
Original Sites					
6 months or more *	5.92	11.50	3.00	11.33	1.00
less than 6 months *	8.13	2.80	5.00	7.00	0.00
Improved Sites					
6 months or more *	6.00	16.50	0.00	7.00	0.00
less than 6 months *	4.33	3.67	0.00	0.00	0.00
Discontinued Sites	4.50	26.00	1.00	5.23	0.00

* duration of client placements at given sites

Table 3

Client Working Patterns: Mean Number of Working Clients Per Placing Organization at Original or Improved Sites

	Competitive Employment	Job Coach	Enclave	Mobile Crew	Othe
Clients at Original Sites					
6 months or more *	7.36	8.50	12.00	9.55	3.0
less than 6 months *	7.70	3.00	5.00	6.75	0.00
Clients at Improved Sites					
6 months or more *	3.50	19.00	0.00	4.00	0.00
less than 6 months *	4.50	5.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Clients Not Now Working at Improved or Original Sites	6.07	20.25	4.00	4.00	0.00

* duration of client placements at given sites.

Table 4

Time Spent by Directors/Job Developers

	Hours Spent		Valued Importance	
	Rank	% of Total	Rank	Mean Rating
Training clients on the job.	1	18.90%	1	4.28
Finding new job possibilities.	2	14.17%	4	3.96
Maintaining informal contact w/employers/supervisors.	3	12.34%	3	4.04
Supervising clients on the job.	4	10.85%	6	3.83
Resolving client problems.	5	7.44%	2	4.04
Assessing clients.	6	7.17%	9	3.65
Encouraging potential jobs.	7	7.09%	5	3.88
Training clients for placement.	8	6.38%	10	3.35
Providing orientation and training to non-handicapped employers/supervisors/ co-workers of clients.	9	6.12%	7	3.79
Conducting job analysis.	10	4.90%	8	3.75
Other	11	4.64%	11	2.75
Total		100.00%		

* on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not important and 5 being most importan

Table 4 shows a comparison of the percentage of total time spent by directors and job developers with a ranking of the considered importance of each of the ways time is necessarily spent by them. Training Clients On The Job consumes the most time (18.90%) and is considered the most important function (M = 4.28). Finding New Job Possibilities ranks second (14.17%) in time spent and ranks fourth (M = 3.96) in considered importance. Maintaining Informal Contact with Employers or Supervisors ranks third (12.34%) in time spent and ranks third (M = 4.04) in considered importance. The functions that consume the least amount of time are Conducting Job Analysis, which ranks tenth (4.90%) in time spent and eighth (M = 3.75) in considered importance, and Other, which ranks 11th (4.64%) in time spent and 11th (M = 2.75) in considered importance.

Table 5 explores the reasons used by job developers to persuade employers to accept disabled clients as workers. Sixteen possible reasons were evaluated on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not persuasive to 5 being most persuasive. The most highly rated reasons reflect the positive qualities of the organization and of the individuals and possess the common themes of responsibility and support. Qualities of the placing organization ranked first (availability in case of problems, M = 4.47), third (responsibility for the quality of the work, M = 4.17), fifth (responsibility for on-the-job training, M = 3.63), and sixth (responsibility for daily supervision, M = 3.61). Qualities of the clients ranked second (good attendance, M = 4.20), fourth (low turnover, M = 4.00), and fifth (positive work habits, M = 3.70). The reasons considered least persuasive are the placing organization's providing of transportation (ranks 15th, M = 2.66) and the company can be reimbursed for or write-off the cost of physical accommodations made for disabled workers (ranks 16th, M = 2.38).

The strategies used by job developers to create jobs are illustrated in Table 6. Fourteen possible strategies were presented, and each strategy was rated on a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 being not an important strategy to 5 being a most important strategy. Businesses were grouped according to size (40 or fewer employees, 40 to 199 employees, and 200 or more employees) to find out if the consideration of size was a part of the job developer's strategic planning. Concentration on small companies ranks first (M = 3.54); concentration on mid-sized companies ranks 5.5 (M = 2.75); and concentration on large companies ranks 13th (M = 1.93). Size appears to be an important consideration. Another spread occurs in the area of marketing research. "I do my own marketing research" ranks second (M = 3.17), while "I employ a professional marketing researcher" ranks 14th (M = 1.40). Reflecting on the concentration upon small companies are the strategies "I develop contacts through participation in clubs and associations" (ranks 3rd, M = 3.07) and "I tap friends and relatives of mine, of clients, and/or of staff" (ranks 4th, 3.03): The size and nature of the companies will be restricted by the social circles of the clubs and associations and by the family associations,

Table 5

Reasons Used by Job Developers to Persuade Employers To Accept Disabled Clients as Workers

	Rank	Mean Rating *
Placing organization available in case of problems.	1	4.47
Good attendance of clients.	2	4.20
Placing organization responsible for quality of work.	3	4.17
Low turnover of clients.	4	4.00
Positive work habits of clients.	5	3.70
Placing organization responsible for on-the-job training.	6	3.63
Placing organization responsible for daily supervision.	7	3.61
Tax incentives for employing clients.	8	3.53
Positive community image of company.	9	3.50
Good safety record of clients.	10	3.30
Placing organization financially competitive with other sources of labor.	11	3.27
Placing organization responsible for orientation and education of employees to accept and work with clients.	12	3.10
Social appropriateness of clients.	13	2.90
Compliance with Affirmative Action.	14	2.80
Placing organization provides transportation.	15	2.66
Company can be reimbursed for or write off cost of physical accomodations.	16	2.38

* on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not persuasive to 5 being most persuasive

thus restricting the breadth of possibilities to a more comfortable and informal network of acquaintances.

The reasons for the prevention of a site establishment as well as the causes for site termination are explored in Table 7. Factors that might prevent the establishment of a work site and also that might cause the termination of a work site were presented, and respondents ranked the factors on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not severe to 5 being most severe. Interestingly, the Economic Situation ranks first as a prevention of establishment (M = 4.08) and first as a cause of termination (M = 3.81). Transportation Problems ranks second as a prevention (M = 3.46) and tenth as a cause of termination (M = 2.77). Agency Operating Expenses versus Agency Returns ranks third as a prevention (M = 3.40) and seventh as a cause of termination (M = 3.00). Lack of External (Parent, Group Home) Support ranks fourth as a prevention (M = 3.35) and third as a cause of termination (M = 3.25). Client Work Performance ranks 5.5 as a prevention (M = 2.85) and second as a cause of termination (M = 3.59). The largest discrepancy in ranking occurs with Company Management Turnover, which ranks 13th in prevention (M = 2.18) and 4th in cause of termination (M = 3.18). Company Management Turnover, therefore, is perceived as a frequent cause of site termination. In contrast, management turnover either is not considered when a site is being planned, may be considered and is out of the control of the job developer, or, if known, is not considered highly important by the job developer.

The current placement situations in Job Coach, Enclave, and Mobile Crew work are considered in Table 8. The mean number of companies (per placing organization) considering accomodation of a mode of supported work is 4.00 for Job Coach, 1.73 for Enclave, and 1.90 for Mobile Crew. The mean number of potential placements (per placing organization) is 4.30 for Job Coach, 10.55 for Enclave, and 5.30 for Mobile Crew. The stages of consideration (Initial, Mid, or Ready-to-go) are somewhat discouraging, in that 100.00% of the Job Coach possibilities are in either the Initial or Mid stages of consideration, 100.00% of the Enclave possibilities are in either the Initial or Mid stages of consideration, and 80.00% of the Mobile Crew possibilities are in Initial or Mid stages of consideration. This would indicate that despite the reasonable success rate indicated in Table 1, very few opportunities in the areas of Job Coach, Enclave, and Mobile Crew employment are in the offing.

Discussion

The results of this study contribute to what is recorded about job developers, both those who are primarily directors of organizations and agencies and those whose responsibility is primarily the development of employment opportunities for developmentally disabled people. We do have a sense of how these job developers spend their time, approach prospective employers of their clients, and attempt to develop business

Table 6

Strategies for Developing Job Opportunities

	Rank	Mean Rating *
I concentrate on small (40 or less) companies.	1	3.54
I do my own marketing research.	2	3.17
I develop contacts through participation in clubs and associations.	3	3.07
I tap friends and relatives of mine, of clients, and/or of staff.	4	3.03
I concentrate on mid-size (40 to 199 employees) companies.	5.5	2.75
I use a state or federal agency.	5.5	2.75
I use the Yellow Pages.	7	2.50
I make contacts through community organizations.	8	2.36
I advertise.	9	2.13
I use the newspaper classified section.	10	2.10
I develop contacts through social clubs.	11	2.03
I concentrate on franchise or chain businesses.	12	2.00
I concentrate on large (200 or more employees) companies.	13	1.93
I employ a professional marketing researcher.	14	1.40

* on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not important to 5 being most important

Table 7

Reasons for Prevention of Site Establishment and Cause of Site Termination

	Prevention of Site Establishment		Causes of Site Termination	
	Rank	Mean Rating *	Rank	Mean Rating *
Economic situation.	1	4.08	1	3.81
Transportation problems.	2	3.46	10	2.77
Agency operating expenses v. returns.	3	3.40	7	3.00
Lack of external (parent, group home) support.	4	3.35	3	3.25
Client work performance.	5.5	2.85	2	3.59
Client social/interpersonal skills.	5.5	2.85	6	3.06
Lack of upper management support.	7	2.81	5	3.13
Unanticipated degree of job difficulty.	8	2.72	7	3.00
Business hiring agency supervisory staff.	9	2.65	12	2.14
Actual or potential loss of financial support for client.	10	2.63	11	2.56
Change in work requirements.	11	2.44	9	2.88
Presence of training/supervisory person was a hindrance.	12	2.33	14	1.88
Company management turnover.	13	2.18	4	3.18
Agency supervisory staff turnover.	14	1.96	13	2.07
Problems with workers' benefits or monetary compensation.	15	1.90	15	1.77
Negative effect on contract work in the workshop or work activity center.	16	1.74	16	1.43

* on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not severe to 5 being most severe

relationships. We also have a sense of what is happening in the field of job development relative to particular modes of supported employment. Finally, we are in the position to make several observations.

In Table 1, the percentages of Receptive Employers compared with Contacted Employers are fairly inconsistent from one employment mode to another. The particularly low response in the Any Employment category (03.29%) may be explained on the premise that job developers are more successful when they approach employers with a specific plan and less successful when they are unprepared to describe the conditions that will support their clients when they work. On the other hand, the number of employers contacted for any employment (N = 1670) may represent not only those contacted by phone or personally, but also those contacted by a mass mailing, from which a large positive response would not be expected. Nevertheless, the premise that a job developer is more successful in developing receptive reactions when a particular goal is sought is still supported. The aberrant pattern in the Job Coach category in Table 1 can be explained by the response pattern. Some respondents answered only the numbers of employers contacted and of employers who hired and not the number of receptive employers. Though this aberration shows only in this one instance, it does bring into question whether responses in the Receptive Employers category are generally low. That is, if the low percentage of Receptive Employers, compared with Hiring Employers, is explained by the fact that respondents simply did not answer the question, then such an explanation would be true of all responses in the Receptive Employers category.

The Client and Job Site Patterns (Tables 2 and 3) may shed some light on the complexity and instability of the Job Coach mode of employment: For both sites and clients, the means of six months or more are greater than the means for six months or less (Original Sites, M = 11.50 v. M = 2.80; Improved Sites, M = 16.50 v. M = 3.67; Clients at Original Sites, M = 8.50 v. M = 3.00; and Clients at Improved Sites, M = 19.00 v. M = 5.00). Additionally, the number of Discontinued Sites (M = 26.00) and the number of clients not working at Improved or Original Sites (M = 20.25) appear, in contrast to the other means, to be quite high. This suggests several possibilities. First, Job Coach placements, by their nature, demand greater input and continued investment on the part of a person or people other than the client; therefore, the ability of that person or those people to support the placement affects the success of the placement; and if the support is not sufficient, success is less likely. Second, Job Coach placements may be more precarious than Competitive Work placements, in that they are more dependent upon external factors for continued success; the greater the support network, the greater the complexity; the greater the complexity, the greater the need is for organization and communication, and the greater the possibility is for something to go wrong. Third, the number of Improved Sites at which clients have worked for six months or more (M = 16.50) and the

Table 8

Businesses Considering Supported Employment

	Job Coach	Enclave	Mobile Crew	Other
Mean number of companies (per placing organization) considering accomodation.	4.00	1.73	1.90	0.00
Mean number of potential placements (per placing organization).	4.30	10.55	5.30	0.00
Initial stage of consideration.	57.00%	80.00%	50.00%	0.00%
Mid stage of consideration.	43.00%	20.00%	30.00%	0.00%
Ready to go.	00.00%	00.00%	20.00%	0.00%

number of clients who have worked at Improved Sites for six months or more (M = 19.00) are comparatively better than the means in those two categories for other modes of working situations, which suggests that, though the possibility of not succeeding is high, the possibility of succeeding is also high. Fourth, more capable clients are likely to be placed in competitive rather than in supported employment. Of course, the lingering question is, with reference to Job Coach placements, what are the conditions under which some people succeed and others fail, and is the differentiation a matter of client selection, support network, or placement selection? This study did not attempt to answer these specific questions.

A comparison of the ways in which job developers spend their time with the importance they place on the ways they spend their time (see Table 4) illuminates a perplexing ordering of priorities. The comparative ranking of "Resolving client problems" and "Assessing clients" shows that though "Resolving client problems" ranks fifth (7.44%) in time spent, it ranks second (M = 4.04) in valued importance, and though "Assessing clients" ranks sixth (7.09%) in time spent, it ranks ninth (M = 3.65) in valued importance. In other words, resolving client problems is considered, in terms of rank order, considerably more important than assessing clients; furthermore, resolving client problems takes up slightly more time than does assessing clients. Nevertheless, a higher priority on assessment as well as more time devoted to assessment would likely decrease the amount of time spent on resolving client problems. This, of course, assumes that the problems, or at least some of the problems, can be anticipated. Table 7 indicates that some of the reasons for prevention of site establishment and for site terminations can be enumerated; about half of the reasons are client related. It may be possible that more could be predicted as potential reasons for client problems, and, consequently, anticipated more often.

That job developers must spend more time on resolving problems than on assessment is not particularly surprising given the demands placed upon the job developers. The considerable spread in valued importance between the two is surprising if Valued Importance is removed from the necessities and problems of everyday existence and not related to the demands of the job; on the other hand, the spread is not surprising if Valued Importance is not an objective evaluation but, instead, is a reflection of the demands placed upon the job developers. In other words, resolving client problems is more important than assessing clients because resolving problems is a more immediate concern than is assessment. Consequently, Valued Importance is not so much a reflection of what should be important as it is a reflection of what tends to be important given the expectations of job development. The value of prioritizing the reasons used by job developers to persuade employers to accept disabled clients as workers (Table 5) is not necessarily immediate. Though knowledge of the rank ordered reasons does contribute to the information about job developer tactics, the primary value may be in comparing this rank ordering with a rank ordering of the same reasons by potential employers. In other words, are the reasons that job developers present to prospective employers apt to be the most persuasive from the employers' point of view? This study did not pursue this question. Given the information presented by this study, job developers can be said to attempt to persuade employers with a balanced argument which includes both reasons relative to client qualities and reasons relative to organization qualities.

The information made available by Table 6 (Strategies for Developing Job Opportunities) has both an immediate and a future value. Like the information of Table 5, the rank ordering here can be compared with a rank ordering by employers to find out if the strategies of job developers are perceived by employers as being potentially effective. Additionally, elaborating upon the observation made earlier (See Results), the strategies of the job developers appear to perpetuate the job developers' associations with smaller companies with no guarantee that the small and mid-size companies are more receptive to developmentally disabled workers than large companies. The highest ranking strategy that might break the job developer's limited circle of potential employers is "I use a state or federal agency" (ranks 5.5, M = 2.75). The general observation is that the strategies are skewed toward smaller companies and individual job developer opinion and decision making and away from larger companies and others' decision making ("I employ a professional marketing researcher"). Several alternative explanations are possible. Generally speaking: (a) job developers have found large companies not particularly accessible; (b) job developers have found large companies comparatively complex; (c) job developers do not have access to the money to employ a professional market researcher and, consequently, have to rely upon themselves; and (d) job developers are essentially small business people, are experienced and comfortable in small business circles, have their contacts in small businesses, and, therefore, continue to pursue opportunities in small businesses. This is not to say that smaller businesses are not worthwhile pursuits. This is to say that job developers appear to look for jobs in the smaller companies, not because the chances of successful obtainment of jobs are better, but because the job developers' contacts are with the smaller companies and not with the larger companies, even if the larger companies might be more fertile ground for the creation of jobs for developmentally disabled people.

Both the reasons for prevention of site establishment as well as the causes of site termination (Table 7) affect the plans and strategies of the job developers and are of interest here. Generally, the reasons/causes can be divided into four groups: (a) those which are taken care of prior to placement and are not a major cause of termination; (b) those which either are not or cannot be taken care of prior to placement and tend to be a cause of termination; (c) those which prevent the establishment of employment sites and cause the termination of sites; and (d) those which do not appear significantly to affect either the establishment or the termination of sites. Transportation Problems is indicative of the first group. Company Management Turnover is indicative of the second group. Economic Situation is indicative of the third group. And Negative Effect on Contract Work in the Workshop is indicative of the fourth group.

Client Work Performance necessitates some comment. As a Prevention, it ranks 5.5 ($M = 2.85$), and as a Cause of Termination, it ranks second ($M = 3.59$). In other words, it is considered a greater cause of termination than it is a prevention. This situation may be explained in several ways: (a) borderline clients may be put in situations which are too difficult, given their preparation and abilities, or in which they do not receive adequate support; (b) the difficulties of the working sites may not be fully appreciated by the job developers when placements are made; and (c) job opportunities may be scarce, and even when a placement has predictable problems (such as being potentially too difficult), any placement is better than no placement at all. A superior success rate (by limiting the number of placements to a more select group of clients) is not necessarily a preferable alternative.

The current picture of supported employment (Table 8) suggests a lack of methodical development. Either the present study did not accurately assess the development of supported employment opportunities or, possibly, the acquisition of jobs does not follow the methodical pattern of three stages of consideration. An alternative to the pattern might be that job developers do not necessarily plan for employment situations but that they work as opportunists, establishing and keeping contacts, waiting for an opening, and moving in when the opportunity presents itself. Consequently, job development is always at the initial stage of consideration, does not methodically progress, and, therefore, cannot be accurately assessed by stage classification.

Implications

The present study sought to identify some of the critical factors that comprise the job development and acquisition process and gain a perspective on some of the tactics and strategies used by the job developers. A third objective, an assessment of the tactics and strategies based upon quantified productivity, necessitates another study which would probe the reactions of employers to the strategies of job developers and attempt to assess the of various employers (e.g., of small, mid-size, and large companies) to job developer strategies. Immediately, however, the present study's information reflects to the job developers how they, as a group, tend to go about their business, without evaluating whether their tactics are necessarily better or worse than any of the alternatives. This study takes us part way to being able to direct job developers toward those situations that are potentially the most viable by (a) assessing the current state of affairs, in particular, the job development of supported employment options, and (b) clarifying how job developers, as a group, utilize their time, operationalize strategies to develop and acquire job opportunities, and try to persuade potential employers to hire their clients. This study supplies one piece of information regarding the scope of the market for supported employment. As that picture becomes more clear, promotional policies regarding supported employment may be adjusted accordingly.

The potential benefits of supported employment have been demonstrated in several model programs. Effective employment support tactics have been determined by empirical means, albeit typically in isolation from one another. The manner in which supported employment models and tactics are recombined in ongoing service programs is, to say the least, non-methodical. It is an unwarranted assumption that, once a support model is tested, even replicated, widespread implementation of that model yielding similar results can be expected. A formidable task remains consisting of the welding of technological developments with policy implementation processes to produce functional dissemination of knowledge.

REFERENCES

Appell, M. J., Williams, C. M., & Fishell, K. N. (1962). Significant factors in placing mental retardates from a workshop situation. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, *41*(3), 260-265.

Appell, M. J., Williams, C. M., & Fishell, K. N. (1964-65). Factors in the job holding ability of the mentally retarded. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, *13*(2), 127-130.

Bellamy, G. T., Rhodes,, L. E., & Albin, J. M. (1986). Supported employment. In W. E. Kiernan & J. A. Stark (Eds.), *Pathways to employment for adults with developmental disabilities* (pp. 129-138). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Bellamy, G. T., Rhodes, L. E., Bourbeau, P. E., & Mank, D. M. (1982). *Mental retardation services in sheltered workshops and day activity programs: Consumer outcomes and policy alternatives*. Paper presented at the National Working Conference on Vocational Services and Employment Opportunities sponsored by the President's Committee on Mental Retardation, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and the Association for Retarded Citizens, Madison, WI. (Available at Specialized Training Program, College of Education, University of Oregon.)

Brickey, M., Browning, L., & Campbell, K. (1982). Vocational histories of sheltered workshop employees placed in Projects With Industry and competitive jobs. *Mental Retardation*, *20*(2), 52-57.

Brickey, M., & Campbell, K. (1981). Fast food employment for moderately and mildly mentally retarded adults: The McDonald's Project. *Mental Retardation*, *19*, 113-116.

Brown, L., Ford, A., Nisbet, J., Sweet, M., Donnellan, A., & Gruenwald, L. (1983). Opportunities available when severely handicapped students attend chronological age appropriate regular schools. *Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped*, *8*(1), 16-24.

Brown, L., Nisbet, J., Ford, A., Sweet, M., Shiraga, B., York, J., & Loomis, R. (1983). The critical need for non-school instruction in educational programs for severely handicapped students. *Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped*, *8*(3), 71-77.

Brown, L., Shiraga, B., York, J., Kessler, K., Strohm, B., Rogan, P., Sweet, M., Zanella, K., VanDeventer, P., & Loomis, R. (1984). Integrated work opportunities for adults with severe handicaps: The extended training option. *Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped*, *9*(4), 262-269.

Burrow, W. H. (1967). Job development: A problem in interpersonal dynamics. *Training School Bulletin, 64*(1), 12-20.

Cohen, J. S. (1967). Employer attitudes toward hiring mentally retarded individuals. In L. V. Stahlecker (Ed.), *Occupational information for the mentall retarded* (pp. 671-684). Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.

Emener, W. G., & McHargue, J. M. (1978). Employer attitudes toward the employment and placement of the handicapped. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 9*(3), 120-125.

Ford, L., Dineen, J., & Hall, J. (1984). Is there life after placement? *Educational and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 19*, 291-296.

Greenspan, S., & Schoultz, B. (1981). Why mentally retarded adults lose their jobs: Social competence as a factor in work adjustment. *Applied Research in Mental Retardation, 2*, 23-38.

Gruenhagen, K. A. (1982). Attitudes of fast food restaurant managers towards hiring the mentally retarded. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 5*(2), 98-105.

Hasazi, S. B., Gordon, L. R., & Roe, C. A. (1985). Factors associated with the employment status of handicapped youth exiting high school from 1979 to 1983. *Exceptional Children, 51*(6), 455-469.

Hawkins, J. A. (1984). *Follow-up study of special education graduates: Class of 1983*. Rockville, MD: Department of Educational Accountability. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 256 786)

Hill, M. L., Banks, P. D., Handrich, R. R., Wehman, P. H., Hill, J. W., & Shafer, M. S. (1987). Benefit-cost analysis of supported competitive employment for persons with mental retardation. *Research in Developmental Disabilities, 8*(1), 71-89.

Jacobs, J. W. (1978). Gleaning: Sheltered employment for retarded adults in rural areas. *Mental Retardation, 16*(2), 118-122.

Mank, D. M., Rhodes, L. E., & Bellamy, G. T. (1985). Four supported employment alternatives. In W. Kiernan & J. Stark (Eds.), *Pathways to employment for developmentally disabled adults* (pp. 139-153). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Minton, E. B. (1977). Job placement: Strategies and techniques. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 21*(2), 141-149.

Mithaug, D. E. (1979). Negative employer attitudes toward hiring the handicapped: Fact or fiction? *Journal of Contemporary Business, 8*(4), 19-26.

Mithaug, D., Hagmeier, L., & Haring, N. (1977). The relationship between training activities and job placement in vocational education of the severely and profoundly handicapped. *AAESPH Review, 2*, 89-109.

National Alliance of Business. (1986). *Employment policies: Looking to the year 2000*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education. (1985). *Employment for persons with severe disabilities: Interagency strategies for expanding work opportunities* (report of a national conference). Washington, DC: Author.

Parent, W. S., & Everson, J. M. (1986). Competencies of disabled workers in industry: A review of business literature. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 52*(4), 16-23.

Payne, J. S., & Chaffin, J. D. (1968). Developing employer relations in a work study program for the educable mentally retarded. *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 3*(3), 127-122.

Rhodes, L. E., & Valenta, L. (1985). Industry-based supported employment: An enclave approach. *Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped, 10*(1), 12-20.

Rusch, F. R., & Schutz, R. P. (1979). Non-sheltered competitive employment of the mentally retarded adult: Research to reality? *Journal of Contemporary Business*, *8*(4), 85-98.

Salamone, P. R. (1971). A client-centered approach to job placement. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, *19*(4), 266-270.

Shafer, M. S., Hill, J., Seyfarth, J., & Wehman, P. (1987). *Competitive employment and workers with mental retardation: An analysis of employers' perceptions and experiences*. Unpublished manuscript, Virginia Commonwealth University, Rehabilitation Research and Training Center.

Tarr, R. F., & Lewis, J. P. (1977). *1974-76 follow-up of the physically handicapped in Pennsylvania*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University, Institute for Research on Human Resources. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 149 165).

Ugland, R. P. (1977). Job seekers' aids: A systematic approach for organizing employer contacts. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, *21*(2), 107-115.

Vogelsberg, R. T. (1986). Competitive employment in Vermont. In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), *Competitive employment issues and strategies* (pp. 43-49). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Wehman, P. (1975). Behaviorial self-control with the mentally retarded. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 6*, 27-34.

Wehman, P., Hill, J. W., & Koehler, F. (1979). Helping severely handicapped persons enter competitive employment. *AAESPE Review, 4*(3), 274-290.

Wehman, P., & Kregel, J. (1985). A supported work approach to competitive employment of individuals with moderate and severe handicaps. *Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped, 10*(1), 3-11.

Wehman, P., Kregal, J., & Seyfarth, J. (1985). Employment outlook for young adults with mental retardation. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 29*(2), 90-99.

ADMINISTRATOR'S PERCEPTIONS OF EARLY WORK EXPERIENCE

Joseph J. Stowitschek

There have been some recognizable gains in the development of transition programming for handicapped youth, particularly as a result of joint federal initiatives in special education, rehabilitation and developmental disabilities. These gains are most pronounced with those who are considered to be moderately to severely disabled because the emphasis has been placed on them (Will, 1985; Black, 1976). Although transition has been conceived of as encompassing the full range of handicapping conditions, there are concerns that the vocational needs of mildly handicapped secondary students are not being adequately addressed (Knowlton & Clark, 1987; Maddox & Edgar, 1984; Edgar, 1985, 1987).

Although there has been considerable emphasis on improving secondary special education programs over the past several years (McNutt & Heller, 1978), the emphasis has been mainly on academics (Edgar, 1987) and academic support skills such as study skills and communication skills (Alley & Deshler, 1979). As an example of the lack of vocational emphasis for mildly handicapped persons, an examination of two recent volumes of the Journal of Learning Disabilities (1984, 1985), containing over 290 research articles and position papers, revealed no articles pertaining to vocational skills, transition programming, or employment. Two highly relevant articles were found in the 1986 volume. Granted, the transition to postsecondary education programs is an important one for some mildly handicapped persons. However, the direct transition into work is an equally likely avenue for many mildly handicapped high school students (Hodell, 1984; Mithaug, Horiuchi, & Fanning, 1985) and it appears to pose some particular problems. Hasazi (1985) describes a period of floundering for many of these youth once they leave high school.

Estimates of the number of unemployed and underemployed mildly handicapped youth range as high as 61% (Hasazi, Gordon, & Roe, 1985). A large number of special education students drop out of high school and many of them remain unemployed or underemployed (Edgar, 1987). Edgar's (1987) concern that our secondary special education programs lack relevance to the conditions of adult life seems well founded. Apparently, the opportunity to engage in many of the behaviors expected in adult life is not present in high school instruction. It is ironic that the framework for engaging in work-related behaviors during high school (work study, work experience, cooperative education, part-time employment) has been in place for many years, yet so many mildly handicapped youth and young adults are unemployed (Malouf, 1982). If one accepts the premise that the opportunity to engage in the behaviors of desired skills in the settings of expected application is a crucial component of instruction, then these work experiences are either under-used, misused, or, in some cases, not used at all.

This summary of a section of the transition literature for mildly handicapped persons is focused on experiences that permit them to engage in work-like behavior which should ultimately fulfill expectations of employers for entry level employees. It contains: (a) a brief review of the historical participation of mildly handicapped students in vocational education components which provide work experiences, (b) a discussion of research on the benefits and possible drawbacks of work experiences, (c) a presentation of collateral issues that represent either hindrances or aides to the participation of handicapped persons in work experiences, and (d) a concluding summation of implications for research related to school policies regarding early work experiences. Finally, subsequent research on early work experiences is described and conclusions are drawn.

The problem of the unemployed handicapped has long been an issue for parents and educators but one that has not been adequately addressed by policymakers. Recognition of the need for a national effort is evidenced in the concern expressed by the Senate Subcommittee on the Handicapped during its 1986 hearings regarding their estimates that 67% of all handicapped are not working and, of those who do work 75% are most likely to be employed part-time. Historically, employment support and job training programs for the handicapped exiting school started some 25 years after federal assistance for other hard to place workers. The 1943 Vocational Rehabilitation Act provided rehabilitation assistance for mentally disabled persons (Meers, 1980). In the 1950s, work study programs for handicapped youth were started and set a precedent for training them through the school system (Halpern, 1973; Brolin, 1976). In most of the programs, students were provided with work on the school site followed by placement in jobs out in the community.

Increased interest in programs for persons with handicaps occurred in the 1960s and, along with it, a greater emphasis on vocational programming. The 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibited discrimination in education and social areas. Many states began to provide special education to handicapped youth in the secondary schools. In 1975, PL 94-142 mandated appropriate education services in the least restrictive environment and PL 989-199 has cleared the way for transitional service development. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 and later amendments in 1968 and 1976 attempted to increase participation of youth and adults in vocational programs by setting aside special funds (Meers, 1980). In 1984, the Carl Perkins Act increased the emphasis on equal access and participation of handicapped and disadvantaged persons in vocational education. The development of work experience programs parallels the implementation of this legislation, albeit more delayed for youth with disabilities.

In the 1960s, cooperative vocational education programs began to emerge in the secondary schools. These programs included work experiences and were intended to unite the school and community in an integrated program (Meers, 1980). They would introduce each student to a particular field of business (i.e., distribution) and provide career level employment while creating an environment that was to contribute to increased awareness about further career opportunities. Special needs students were typically placed in the programs only if they had received adequate prevocational training (Harrington, 1982). Before educators' concern over the level of participation of handicapped youth is addressed, it is important to explore whether they gain from the experiences.

Not all educators express a positive attitude regarding work experiences, nor are all research results entirely positive. In fact, many have considered certain mildly handicapped groups, such as learning disabled adults, to be vocationally well adjusted, even if they completed a secondary education program that was exclusively academically oriented (Horn, O'Donnell, & Vitulano, 1983). Regardless of the current "bleaker" employment picture, early studies of learning disabled adults lead Horn and his colleagues (Horn et al., 1983) to state:

> Followup studies which have included measures of educational/vocational attainment levels present convincing evidence that LD persons do attain educational levels and vocational status that is commensurate with normal learners. (p. 553)

In his reply to critics of early work experiences, Malouf (1982) made the point, ". . . educators who conclude that development of actual job skills is of secondary importance should talk to people in industry" (p. 18).

Some studies achieved mixed results on the effects of work study programs. Wilburn (1975) reported limited differences between dropouts who did and did not participate in a work study program on most measures except for a slightly higher incidence of employment. Gilbert (1973) found a wide divergence in curriculum practices, supervision and outcomes in work study programs for educable mentally retarded students in Utah. Results of a 12-week work study intervention with educable mentally retarded adolescents in Philadelphia showed that participants exhibited fewer school absences, no difference in behavior problems and a greater knowledge of job-related skills than non-participants. Levels of employment were not assessed.

Drawbacks notwithstanding, the benefits of early work experiences for handicapped youth have been demonstrated for years. Results of a state-wide study in Texas (Strickland & Arrell, 1967) revealed that special education students who graduated from work study experiences could be hired for jobs which approximated those experiences. Halpern (1973) studied the impact of prevocational training on the employment status of 108 educable mentally retarded students in work experience programs in Oregon. The students' employment rates were comparable to an adjusted rate for 16 to 21 year-old members of the general population. The study was followed by a post hoc evaluation of national work study projects in which fully served clients were evaluated. Findings were that graduates of work study programs were more successful in finding employment. In a study of an early predecessor of Project Workability, Mock (1974) found that educable mentally retarded graduates of the work study program demonstrated greater vocational adjustment and 30% higher employment rates than graduates of a traditional non-work study high school program. More recently, state-wide studies of special education students in Colorado (Mithaug & Horiuchi, 1983; Mithaug, Horiuchi, & Fanning, 1985) were conducted to determine their employment status. It was found that students who had not been in work study training programs did not use community resources effectively and were unemployed more than those who had been in the programs. Similar findings were reported by Wehman, Kregel and Seyfarth (1985). In a state-wide study in Vermont, Hasazi, Gordon and Roe (1985) found that handicapped youth who left or graduated from high school between 1979 and 1983 were likely to be employed if they had participated in part-time or summer work while in school.

How are work experience programs for handicapped youth perceived by educators? The extent and range of information is limited but four studies were reported which addressed this topic. In a study of work experience programs in Michigan, Foster (1985) found the roles and responsibilities of special education work study coordinators to extend far beyond job placement and training. They perceived their roles to be a combination of teacher and administrator, and expressed concern regarding the professional liability associated with the placement of students in jobs. In an earlier study, Horiuchi (1973) surveyed rehabilitation counselors and secondary special educators in Colorado regarding cooperative work experiences for handicapped youth and their respective role perceptions. She found that their role perceptions differed significantly, with special educators indicating that they are taking on a number of rehabilitation roles but counselors not indicating they strongly assumed education-oriented roles. The roles and responsibilities of local vocational directors in regards to handicapped and disadvantaged youth was studied by Valentine and Oshima (1979) in Colorado. However, their study did not single out any form of work experiences. They found that vocational directors discouraged handicapped youth from enrolling in vocational programs and felt that these youth were generally unable to complete the programs. It was concluded that the vocational educator's understanding of the handicapped needs to be expanded.

The one study regarding work experiences for handicapped youth that focused on high school principals was done in Texas (Smith, 1977). He found that principals expressed a generally positive attitude about work study and that they held more positive attitudes toward non-handicapped students than toward handicapped students in general. He also found that the attitudes toward handicapped persons in general were interrelated with their ratings of work study participation.

Principals indicated they had few contacts with handicapped youth in school. Principals' support of handicapped youth in work study was not assessed. Administrative and teacher support for the development of work experiences and other transition programming is sorely needed judging by the sparseness of the research, the demonstrated utility and the high degree of variance in participation.

There are several trends in education that have a potentially large influence on the opportunities of handicapped youth to participate in work experiences as well as other vocational activities. The "excellence in education" movement, with its emphasis on preparing more students for entry into colleges and universities has been frequently cited as presenting problems for special educators (Knowlton & Clark, 1987; Edgar, 1987; Halpern, 1985; Brown, Halpern, Brody-Hasazi, & Wehman, 1987). One concern is that the academic emphasis may prevent continued or increased support for vocationally oriented programs (Clark, 1985). High school completion requirements pose a particular problem (Benz & Halpern, 1986) that many school districts have yet to resolve. Required credits are often academic courses and special education tracks are typically dependent upon waiver of required courses in place of electives. The relationship between high school completion requirements and administrators' willingness or prerogatives to support vocational innovations has yet to be determined.

The emphasis of secondary special education programs, paired with the training emphasis of secondary special education teachers, appear to be stumbling blocks to the development of transition programming (Edgar, 1987). The traditional curricular emphasis is an academic one (Deshler, Schumaker, & Lenz, 1984; McNutt & Heller, 1978) and, although academic skills are important in adult life, many transition specialists have, for several years, expressed the need to concentrate more directly on functional skills (Anderson, 1975; Nacson & Kelly, 1980; Black, 1976). The failure of secondary education programs to train functional and generalizable skills has often been pointed out as a source of the problem. In reference to durability of the skills trained in high school programs, Deshler and his colleagues (Deshler et al., 1984) expressed the following:

> Proof that most intervention programs have failed to promote this type of generalization is found in the research that indicates that mildly handicapped adolescents are not making the school-exit to the world of work successfully. (p. 115)

Similar concerns have been expressed by Fafard and Haubrich (1981), Vetter (1983), and White, Schumaker, Warner, Alley and Deshler (1981).

Until recently, the development of functional skill programming and community oriented instruction has been focused primarily on moderately and severely handicapped persons (Brown, Nietupski, & Hamre-Nietupski, 1976; Liberty, 1985; Bourbeau, 1986; Nietupski, Hamre-Nietupski, Clancy, & Veerhusen, 1986). With the generalization concerns expressed by Deshler and his colleagues (Deshler et al., 1984; White et al., 1981; Vetter, 1983), the need to increase opportunities for mildly handicapped high schoolers in settings of ultimate functioning has been recognized (Marinoble, 1980; Hasazi et al., 1985; Maraski, 1982). Fortunately, a ready training setting for many functional community-related skills is accessible by special education teachers, embodied in the variety of work experience programs offered in the nation's high schools. If the settings for community-based vocational training are available to special educators, a logical next question is, are they being used by them?

Several concerns regarding the preparation of special education teachers have been expressed by transition specialists. In a recent study Benz and Halpern (1987) found that 40% of high school special education teachers held elementary school certification with little background pertaining specifically to adolescents. Gilbert (1973) found that many secondary special education teachers were interested in the vocational development of their students but that there was a wide range of vocational training skills and opportunities. Horiuchi (1973), in comparing responses to questionnaires between 1969 and 1972, found greater receptivity to increasing the vocational emphasis on the part of high school special education teachers, but cautioned against interpreting these results as implying increased skills or participation. Malouf (1982) is more direct, stating that handicapped students receive inferior vocational training, at least partially because special education teachers have limited vocational expertise.

The need for greater role specialization was identified by Clark (1984) as important for the advancement of transition goals. He urged teacher training program personnel to act rather than react. Otherwise, teachers will be asked to perform role functions for which they are not trained. Such specialization in at least a portion of the teacher preparation program was also advocated by Halpern (Brown et al., 1987). Wehman (Brown et al., 1987) stressed the importance of training secondary special educators in job development skills necessary to support work experiences. On the other hand, Brown (Brown et al., 1987) argued for the training of a generic set of instructional strategies. Brody-Hasazi called for a greater emphasis on vocational preparation and community-based training skills (Brown et al., 1987). Regardless of the diversity of opinion regarding what should be stressed in training, there is a consensus that teachers are ill-prepared for many facets of transition activities related to the schools and, more research and development is needed in order to better prepare them. Benz and Halpern (1987) made the point quite succinctly in the following:

> . . . [s]pecial education at the secondary level is facing rapid changes in policies and direction, and preservice training programs are only now beginning to provide secondary special educators with the unique skills they require. (p. 513)

On a more positive note, the implementation of regulations regarding equal access and participation of handicapped persons in vocational education resulting from the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 provides a clear basis for greater joint programming between regular and special educators. Participation in cooperative work experience programs is a significant portion of the services available which had been previously exclusionary regarding many handicapped youth (Meers, 1980). Implementation of the provisions of the act also poses many problems in policy and management that must be resolved. For instance, although the provisions have just been enacted, the provisions of the set-aside monies tend to limit the range of their use for some of the most needed service development activities. Anecdotal reports suggest some educators are reluctant to "wade" through the paper work and regulations in order to gain access to the funds. Another problem to be overcome is that many special education programs have developed their own vocational education alternatives, particularly in the area of work experiences because access to mainstream vocational education was so often denied to their students (cf. Valentine et al., 1979; Huene, 1979; Mock, 1974). The need for special and vocational educators to re-lay common grounds for cooperation is expressed in Malouf's concern that special education tends to ". . . go it alone too much" (p. 19). Anecdotal reports of successful mainstream vocational and special education programs, as well as special vocational education programs, are replete in the applied literature (cf. Brolin, 1976). Since there is so little data to determine which is more useful under which set of circumstances, decisions regarding local school transition policy can hardly be expected to be empirically based.

In conclusion, school policies regarding handicapped youth are undergoing a re-shaping process (Benz & Halpern, 1987). This process will result in extending the school program into the adult community in order to enhance its relevance to that community. Existing programs, such as those providing work experience will be relied on increasingly because they possess an inherent relevance. Related secondary curricula which had previously been offered in parallel but somewhat separate tracks (i.e., career exploration, job skill development, career education) must become more integrated with work experiences. Research is needed which will help determine the most viable directions for this reshaping process.

Work experiences have been demonstrated as useful in the transition of handicapped youth from school to work but they are often not used to the best benefit. Since they possess a high degree of relevance to a major goal of transition, it seems possible that educators' direct involvement in work experience training should be used to drive secondary curriculum adjustment processes--somewhat in a reverse analysis fashion. In summation, considerably more research information is needed than is available regarding local school programs' development of responsibility for work experience and other transition programming--administrative support, personnel preparation, and joint vocational education services being those of most immediate concern.

PROBLEM

Although many school programs have developed high school work experiences including work study, cooperative education and on-the-job training (e.g., JTPA) which are intended to provide initial employment-related experiences, an alarming number of mildly handicapped youth are either unemployed or underemployed following high school. Despite the data demonstrating that work experiences are valuable for this population, their impact has been limited. Either such experiences are underused, misused or not used at all in many school programs. Several problems have been suggested by transition specialists as to why mildly handicapped persons are not leaving secondary schools as highly skilled, highly employed workers. Among them are (a) mildly handicapped persons have often been excluded from cooperative work experience programs, (b) the "excellence in education" movement has resulted in a de-emphasis on vocational skill development, (c) an academic special education emphasis has precluded mildly handicapped youth from participating in much vocational programming, (d) secondary special education teachers are ill prepared to engage in community-based vocational training. For the most part, these suggestions are not empirically based.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to determine (a) to what extent mildly handicapped youth in Washington are involved in work experiences during high school, (b) how special education administrators and principals perceive the relative importance of students' and teachers' involvement in work experience training, and (c) what conditions tend to hinder the development of more effective vocational training of mildly handicapped youth.

SUBJECTS

Special education directors of school districts with high schools and high school principals in the state of Washington comprised the subject pools for this study. Some special education services were provided either through a cooperative arrangement or by an education service district. In those cases, the combined districts were treated as one unit. The resulting special education subject pool was 197. One high school principal was selected for each district or cooperative with the exception of two large districts, Seattle and Tacoma. Two high school principals were randomly selected from each of those districts. The resulting pool of high school principals was 199.

INSTRUMENT

Two questionnaires were developed for this study, one for special education directors and a second for high school principals. The first questionnaire includes two question groups regarding numbers of handicapped persons, representation of vocational objectives in IEPs, and the numbers of mildly handicapped persons engaged in work experiences. the remaining ten questions are identical for both questionnaires. The questionnaire was formulated from an analysis of the literature. (See Tables 1-12 for illustrations of question-response variables.) A prototype questionnaire was administered on a pilot basis to five special education administrators. The questionnaire was subsequently revised based on feedback from the pilot test respondents.

PROCEDURES

Questionnaires were mailed in stages, first to special education directors and second to high school principals. Approximately three weeks after the first mailing, a second set of questionnaires was mailed to those who had not returned the first questionnaire. The second questionnaire was followed by a telephone call to encourage special education directors and principals to respond. The schedule of mailings occurred as follows:

April 22, 1987 - first mailing to special education directors
May 17, 1987 - second mailing to special education directors
May 22, 1987 - follow-up telephone calls initiated
May, 12, 1987 - first mailing to principals
June 10, 1987 - second mailing to principals
June 14, 1987 - follow-up telephone calls initiated (principals)

RESULTS

A total of 77 responses (39%) have been received from special education directors to date. Responses from high school principals total 68 (34%) to date. Questionnaires are still being received at the rate of two per week. Although the number of responses is considered to be adequate for the purposes of this study, a higher rate would have been desirable. Two conditions appeared to have accounted for the return rate achieved. First, the development and field testing of the questionnaire necessitated that it be distributed toward the latter portion of the school year. Second, unsolicited comments from a number of potential respondents indicate that they received a record number of questionnaires during April and May.

Results of responses to questionnaires are summarized in four sections: (1) information on mildly handicapped students and work experiences, (2) administrator's assessment of school program status regarding work experiences and vocational programming for mildly handicapped students, (3) funding and high school completion requirements that may affect administrator's support of work experience training, and (4) recommended changes in school programming of work experiences.

STUDENT INFORMATION

The responding school districts supplied information on the numbers of high school students whom they considered to be mildly handicapped. Because districts normally report numbers to the state superintendent's office by handicapping condition rather than by severity of the condition, information on the numbers of mildly handicapped students is not readily available. Special education directors supplied numbers based on school district criteria (Table 1). Two-thirds of the students reported were identified as learning disabled and slightly fewer than one-quarter as mildly retarded; the remainder as behavior disordered or other. Less than 40% were reported to have vocational goals in their individual education programs. Although they had no IEP goals related to vocational skills, another 21% were reported to be enrolled in vocational education courses. Other plan areas where vocational activity may be found included current levels of performance (20%) for vocational needs and the IEP service plan (16%).

How much work experience are mildly handicapped youth getting? Of the 5,150 youth reported in respondents' special education programs, 1,493 (27%) are estimated to be involved in work experiences during the school year and 1,914 (37%) are estimated to be in summer jobs. During the school year a total of 892 (17.3%) are in student initiated employment, working an average of 14 hours per week, and 486 (9.4%) are reported to be in school sponsored employment, working an average of 9.4 hours per week (115 unknown). More students are reported to be employed during the summer with 970 (19%) finding their own jobs and 944 (18%) in government or school sponsored employment programs.

PROGRAM STATUS

Perceptions of the extent and type of communication between special and vocational education teachers is reported in Table 2. Special education directors and principals more often selected "monthly or less frequently" as the likely communication rate between special and vocational educators regarding curricular issues. They selected the entire range of "none" to "weekly" equally as often regarding work experiences, job placement or on-the-job training. "None" was the most often selected frequency of communication regarding instruction

TABLE 1

Mildly Handicapped Students in Washington High School Programs as Identified by Special Education Directors in Responding Districts.

	Mildly Retarded		Learning Disabled		Behavior Disordered		Other		Total	
	Number	Perc.	Number	Perc.	Number	Perc.	Number	Perc.	Number	Perc.
Mildly Handicapped Students	1196	23.20	3430	66.60	374	7.30	150	2.90	5150	100.00
In Voc. Ed., Voc. Goals in IEP									1943	37.73
In Voc. Ed., no Voc. Goals in IEP									1082	21.00

TABLE 2

Frequency and Type of Occurrence of Communication Between High School Special and Vocational Education Personnel Regarding Mildly Handicapped Students, as Indicated by School Administrators.

	None		Monthly or less		Bi-Monthly		Weekly	
	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal	SpecEd Dir.	Principal
Coordination of Mildly Handicapped Student Activities	18*	20	42	33	18	21	22	26
Work Experiences, Job Placement, On-The-Job Training	24	32	29	30	29	24	19	13
Instruction, Specifically for Transition to Employment	39	34	29	30	10	4	22	3

* Percentage of respondents.

TABLE 3

Hours Per Week of Release Time, Permitted and Recommended, for Mildly Handicapped Secondary Students by Special Education Directors and High School Principals

	Permitted		Recommended	
	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal
FRESHMAN:				
0 Hrs	58*	80	58	63
1-5 Hrs	27	14	28	29
6-10 Hrs	9	6	12	8
11-15 Hrs	4	0	2	0
16-20 Hrs	0	0	0	0
20 + Hrs	2	0	0	0
SOPHOMORES:				
0 Hrs	35	48	31	44
1-5 Hrs	22	34	27	34
6-10 Hrs	29	12	36	18
11-15 Hrs	6	0	2	2
16-20 Hrs	4	6	4	2
20 + Hrs	4	0	0	0
JUNIORS:				
0 Hrs	17	15	16	5
1-5 Hrs	30	35	22	47
6-10 Hrs	27	31	26	27
11-15 Hrs	13	8	26	15
16-20 Hrs	8	8	9	5
20 + Hrs	5	3	1	1
SENIORS:				
0 Hrs	15	10	14	3
1-5 Hrs	23	28	21	36
6-10 Hrs	26	29	21	24
11-15 Hrs	15	16	21	21
16-20 Hrs	9	14	19	14
20 + Hrs	12	3	4	2
Total	100			

---

* Percentage of respondents.

pertaining to transition issues. Special education directors and principals agreed on most categories with the exception of "weekly" contact regarding transition related instruction. Few principals selected it as a likely contact rate.

Release time for mildly handicapped students to engage in work experiences was permitted and recommended at approximately the same levels (Table 3). Special education directors and principals generally shared the same opinions across rating categories. If any difference can be discerned, it is that special education directors' selections tended to be slightly more distributed across the weekly amounts of release time while principals' selections tended to be clustered toward the lower amounts of release time. Most of the respondents agreed that either no or little release time was permitted or recommended for freshmen or sophomores. Although more release time was recommended for juniors, 50% of the principals still indicated that little or no release time was either permitted or recommended for mildly handicapped youth, and a similar number of special education directors indicated the same as permitted (47%) or recommended (40%). Slightly more release time was permitted and recommended for mildly handicapped seniors.

How much release time do school administrators recommend so that school staff may engage in on-site work experience training for handicapped youth? Both special education directors and administrators varied considerably on personnel and amounts of time (Table 4). Approximately half of both groups indicated that vocational education teachers should spend either no class time or occasional site visits. Between 35 and 40% recommended either 1-2 hours per week or one class period per day of release time for vocational education teachers. The pattern for vocational education counselors (for those districts who employed them) was essentially similar. Although some administrators recommended no release time for special education resource teachers, over half of the special education directors and principals recommended from 1-2 hours per week to two class periods per day. Special education directors still recommended the same for self-contained special education teachers but the recommendations from most principals were for less release time. Over 80% of the administrators agreed that high school counselors should spend either no time or occasional site visits in on-site work experience training.

Administrators rated compensatory steps to increase teacher release time to engage in work experience training activities as to whether these steps were prerequisite to releasing them and practical to implement (Table 5). Use of the planning period was rated not prerequisite most often by special education directors and principals but it was also rated as practical by the fewest number of respondents. Special education directors and principals differed somewhat on whether an extended year pay or stipend was not a prerequisite and more special education directors rated it as practical than did principals.

TABLE 4

Release Time Recommended for School Personnel to Conduct Community-Based Placement and Instruction at Job Sites With Mildly Handicapped Students.

	Percentage of Respondents	
	Special Education Directors	Principals
Vocational Education Teachers		
No release time	21	11
Occasional site visits (1-2 Hrs/mo)	28	35
Routine site visits (1-2 Hrs/wk)	14	26
One class period per day	21	21
Two class periods per day	14	3
Three class periods per day	2	2
Vocational Education Counselors		
No release time	18	26
Occasional site visits (1-2 Hrs/mo)	38	40
Routine site visits (1-2 Hrs/wk)	21	16
One class period per day	13	4
Two class periods per day	5	12
Three class periods per day	5	2
Special Education Resource Teachers		
No release time	20	18
Occasional site visits (1-2 Hrs/mo)	18	18
Routine site visits (1-2 Hrs/week)	28	33
One class period per day	26	10
Two class periods per day	6	11
Three class periods per day	2	10
Special Education Classroom Teachers		
No release time	24	24
Occasional site visits (1-2 Hrs/week)	16	24
Routine site visits (1-2 Hrs/week)	16	30
One class period per day	29	6
Two class periods per day	9	9
Three class periods per day	5	7

TABLE 4 (continued)

	Percentage of Respondents	
	Special Education Directors	Principals
High School Counselors -		
No release time	33	41
Occasional site visits (1-2 Hrs/mo)	57	46
Routine site visits (1-2 Hrs/week)	8	11
One class period per day	4	0
Two class periods per day	0	0
Three class periods per day	0	2

TABLE 5

Changes That Would Allow Release Time for Special and Vocational Education Personnel to Participate in Work Experience Instruction

	Percentage Identifying as Not Prerequisite		Percentage Identifying as Practical	
	Special/Ed. Dir.	Principal	Special/Ed. Dir.	Principal
Combine Classes With Second Teacher	44.4*	36.0	36.1**	24.0
Use Planning Period	47.9	40.8	28.8	30.1
Arrange for Aide or Substitute to Cover Class Period	21.5	25.4	44.6	35.0
Extended Year for Additional Pay or Stipend	35.5	23.0	56.0	43.8

* The percentage of respondents rating the item as 0.

** The percentage of respondents rating the item either 4, practical, or 5, most practical.

The responsibility for vocational services to mildly handicapped students was the topic of one question (Table 6). Fewer than one-quarter of the respondents indicated that any of the ten categories of vocational instruction were exclusively the responsibility of either vocational education or special education. Vocational skill building was the only category that was selected by more than half of the respondents as being mostly or exclusively the responsibility of vocational education. Four of the categories were selected by more than half of the respondents as being either mostly or exclusively the responsibility of special education: Prevocational Instruction, Work Adjustment, On-the-job Training and Job Placement. Shared Vocational and Special Education Responsibility were selected by more than one-third of the respondents.

The responsibility for carrying out work experience training and other vocational education activities is viewed as shared by many respondents (Table 7). However, special education directors and principals agreed that the major responsibility for five of the activity categories belonged to special educators. Those categories were Career Exploration, Prevocational Instruction, Job Experience Training Job Placement and Job-related Classroom Instruction. A high number of both administrators selected vocational educators as being responsible for vocational skills assessment. They selected both special and vocational educators with approximately equal frequency as being responsible for vocational counseling. Special education directors selected special education teachers more often as being responsible for vocational assessment and work adaptation training while principals selected vocational educators as often for these tasks. Responsibility for work experience follow up responsibilities were designated across several persons, including outside agencies. However, the responsibilities of outside agencies or high school counselors, with the exception of vocational counseling, is apparently limited to a few districts.

FINANCIAL AND GRADUATION REQUIREMTNTS

As regards uses of Carl Perkins Act Part B monies, special education directors ranked Provide Job Placement Service and Other Work Site Training Experiences in the top three most often, with Provide Vocational Assessment for Handicapped Students following immediately after (Table 8). Principals ranked Increase Participation of Mildly Handicapped Students in vocational education classes first and Job Placement Services second. However, Assessment was also selected frequently as one of the top ranked items. Most highly recommended changes in regulations regarding Part B monies were Support Special Education Sponsored Vocational Education Services and Release Time for Teachers by special education directors (Table 9) Principals most often selected Release Time and Increase Involvement of Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors. However, the frequencies with items were rank ordered in the top three were fairly equally distributed across the items with the exception of Increasing Vocational Education Services for Minorities Who Are Handicapped.

Administrators assessed the contribution of work experience training toward mildly handicapped students' completion of graduation requirements by selecting one or more alternatives which applied in their district (Table 10). Both groups responded in relatively similar proportions on most items. However, they differed on the extent to which work experiences applied in lieu of basic education credits (waiver basis). Over two-thirds of both groups indicated that work study credits were available and part of a regular high school diploma. Only 7% of respondents indicated that work experiences were part of an alternative certificate program.

The willingness of secondary special and vocational education teachers to participate in work experience training for mildly handicapped youth has been questioned in the literature. Responding administrators estimated that less than 40% of special education teachers would be willing to participate and between one-fourth and one-third of vocational educators would be willing to participate (Table 11).

School administrators were asked to comment on program changes that were needed to improve mildly handicapped students' involvement in work experiences and how those changes might be implemented (Table 12). A variety of comments were received but, in general, they were grouped according to: (a) funding issues, (b) administrative-policy changes, (c) personnel changes, (d) curriculum changes, and (e) other recommendations. Six comments pertained to the need to increase funds. Eight comments each pertained to the need to increase opportunities for early work experiences and provide release time for teacher training. The remainder of the comments were shared by three or fewer of the respondents.

DISCUSSION

This study sought to determine, through the perceptions of school administrators, the involvement of mildly handicapped persons in early work experiences, how those experiences related to vocational transition programming in high schools, and what changes in policy implementation are needed in order to improve the utilization of these experiences. A total of 77 special education directors and 75 high school principals returned the survey questionnaires. Both groups were in fairly close agreement on most of their responses. However, there were some differences in opinion on a few key issues.

Although transition to employment has been a major area of emphasis in the state of Washington for at least two years, fewer than 40% of the mildly handicapped students were reported to have vocational goals or objectives in their IEPs. Vocational activity was indicated elsewhere, such as in the IEP present

TABLE 6

Perceptions of Special Education Directors and Principals on Availability of Services for Mildly Handicapped Students

	Vocational Ed. Exclusively		Vocational Ed. Mostly		Shared Vocational Ed.		Special Ed. Mostly		Spec Ed Exclusively	
	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal
Career Exploration	0*	3	17	15	49	43	26	28	8	11
Pre-Vocational	0	5	5	9	43	33	37	38	16	16
Vocational Assessment	10	3	10	13	34	44	30	25	16	14
Vocational Skills	20	22	42	45	28	20	8	9	3	3
Vocational Counseling	2	5	14	17	49	52	31	22	5	3
Work Adaptation	0	3	6	9	39	41	47	39	8	8
On-The-Job Training	10	5	12	19	27	31	32	19	19	26
Job Placement	3	5	10	17	36	27	29	25	21	27
Work Experience Follow-Up	5	7	11	25	37	21	25	18	23	30
Job-Related Classroom Instruction	1	6	9	12	44	42	32	28	13	12

---

* Percentage of respondents selecting particular participation category.

TABLE 7

Personnel Responsible for Carrying-out Vocational Services for Mildly Handicapped Secondary Students

	Responsibilities							
	Special Education		Vocational Education		Outside Agency		High School Counselor	
	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal	Spec/Ed. Dir.	Principal
Career Exploration	44*	47	36	33	8	11	20	23
Pre-Vocational Curriculum	54	54	29	28	4	4	5	11
Vocational Assessment	33	36	28	37	18	17	12	12
Vocational Skills Assessment.	19	22	57	64	3	4	3	5
Vocational Counseling	33	34	31	38	13	12	38	35
Work Adaptation	53	49	26	42	5	7	9	8
Job Experiences	51	42	35	34	13	15	6	6
Job Placement	47	40	28	35	21	19	16	7
Work Experience Follow-up	50	38	32	30	21	19	14	10
Job-Related Classroom Instruction	53	48	37	40	6	6	6	5

---

* Number of respondents who checked this item and category (some respondents checked more than one category in a row).

TABLE 8

Priorities in Uses of Set-Aside Funds of the Carl Perkins Act

	Special Education Directors		Principals	
	Median Rank	Frequency Selected in top 3	Median Rank	Frequency Selected in top 3
Increase Participation of Mildly Handicapped Students in Vocational Education Classes	3.5	34	1	42
Increase Participation of Severely Handicapped Students in Vocational Education Classes	6	11	6	10
Provide Vocational Assessment for Handicapped Students	2	41	4	35
Acquire Specialized Career and Vocational Education Materials	5	26	5	26
Use Instructional Aides to Help Handicapped Students	3.5	34	3	36
Provide Job Placement Service and Other Work Site Training Experiences	1	42	2	37

TABLE 9

Recommended Changes in Regulations regarding Uses of Set-Aside Funds of the Carl Perkins Act to Allow Mildly Handicapped Students Increased Work Experience Opportunities

	Special Education		Principal	
	Median Rank	Frequency Selected in top 3	Median Rank	Frequency Selected in top 3
Support Special Education Sponsored Vocational Education Services	1	61	3	45
Increase Vocational Education Services for Handicapped Persons Who are Also Minorities	5	18	5	15
Provide Release Time for Special Education and Vocational Education Teachers to Pursue School-to-Work Transition Training	2	53	1	49
Increase Involvement of Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors in Providing Early Work Experience for High School Youth	3	46	2	48
Reduce the Match Requirements in Favor of Local School Districts	4	30	4	31

TABLE 10

Work Experience Contribution to High School Graduation Credits

Contribution Categories	Special Education Directors	Principals
Work Study Credits	74*	75
No Direct Contribution	9	4
Part of a Vocational Education Course, Not Part of Basic Education Credit	32	22
Part of a Regular High School Diploma	76	71
Alternative Certification Program for Attendance or Participation	7	7
In Lieu of Basic Education Credits	41	17
Other	0	3

* Respondents may have chosen more than one category.

TABLE 11

Respondents' Estimates of the Number of High School Special and Vocational Education Teachers Available as Compared to Those Willing to Participate in Community-Based Work Experience Training

	Special Education Directors		Principals	
	Special Education Teachers	Vocational Education Teachers	Special Education Teachers	Vocational Education Teachers
Number of Teachers	486	528	521	830
Number of Teachers Willing	184	177	196	208
Percentage Willing	38%	34%	38%	25%

TABLE 12

Administrator's Comments Regarding Policy Changes Needed on Work Experiences and How Those Changes May Be Implemented

Category	Comment	Frequency
Funding		
	Additional funds to hire personnel to implement work experience programs	6
	Make minimum wage available for students in work experience programs	1
	Allow DVR and the schools to share the cost of on-the-job training	1
	State vocational directors need to recognize special education vocational programs as vocational and include in FTE count	1
Administrative-Policy Change		
	Opportunities for early work experiences for MH students	8
	School site changes from building classroom to actual job location	1
	Public relations programs to help rural communities who have little job placement opportunities available	2
	Changes in graduation requirements that would allow flexibility for giving credits and to substitute work experience	2
	Administrative Support of the Concept of Work Experiences	3
	Release time for teachers to learn more about work experience programs	8
	Development of transition services for students in 7th to 12th grade	1
	Services available for freshmen-don't wait until junior and senior	2
	More coordination with state programs to help those areas with few jobs available for students	2

School administrators were asked to comment on program changes that were needed to improve mildly handicapped students' involvement in work experiences and how those changes might be implemented. A variety of comments were received but, in general, they were grouped according to: (a) funding issues, (b) Administrative-policy changes, (c) personnel changes, (d) curriculum changes, and (e) other recommendations. Six comments pertained to the need to increase funds. Eight comments each pertained to the need to increase opportunities for early work experiences and provide release time for teacher training. The remainder of the comments were shared by three or fewer of the respondents.

TABLE 12 (continued)

Category	Comment	Frequency
Personnel Changes		
	Need for more pre-vocational services at the mid-school level	1
	Additional training for teachers about how to handle work experiences	1
	Stronger relationship between special education and vocational education	3
	Coordinated classroom with vocational and special education instructors together	1
	High school counselor to coordinate work-study program	1
Curriculum		
	Co-operative vocational and special education training to teach work-related skills and organize work release programs	1
	Work-related curriculum integrated into required subjects	1
	Regular classroom teachers adapting curriculum for the special needs students	1
Other		
	Acceptance by the community-allowing the students to work	1
	Willingness of student and parent to participate	1
	System to match students with jobs in a non-diversified economy	2
	Student work experience should be improved-not instructor training	1

levels of performance or service plans, or by enrollment in vocational education courses. Nonetheless, vocational development of mildly handicapped youth appears to be grossly underrepresented in IEP goals which are supposed to dictate the minimum content of instruction provided to them.

Many mildly handicapped youth are apparently involved in work experiences, especially during the summer. Unfortunately, the proportion involved during the school year, when special and vocational educators are available to provide training and coordinate other vocational instruction with the experiences, is slightly over one-quarter. Student release time, whether permitted or recommended, varies considerably from district to district. However, few freshmen or sophomores among mildly handicapped students are permitted release time and principals are somewhat more conservative in their recommendations for juniors and seniors than are special education directors.

Special and vocational education teachers are estimated to communicate infrequently regarding vocational instruction topics, the least frequent type being related to transition programming. Special education resource teachers appear to be the most likely candidates for increased release time to conduct training in work experience sites. However, that time would be limited to a few hours per week at most. Options favored by principals for accommodating release time include those involving schedule adjustments or shared teaching responsibilities, while many special education directors rated extended year salaries or stipends as a viable option.

Responsibility for various components of a vocational transition program is viewed largely as a shared condition (should be) but it is uncertain to what extent sharing now occurs, especially considering that communication between vocational and special educators is infrequent.

Prioritization of uses of vocational education funds such as those provided in the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 that fall within the regulations are for job placement and training and vocational assessment. Changes are recommended in the regulations to support increased special education sponsored vocational education and release time for teachers to conduct job placement and training above other changes.

Administrators responses present an interesting picture as regards high school completion requirements and work experiences. Both groups of administrators indicated that credit was earned for work experiences. Surprisingly, most of them indicated that work experiences contributed to a high school diploma and a small percentage indicated they contributed to a certificate of completion. A discrepancy exists regarding the two groups' estimations as to whether work experience credits can be used in lieu of basic academic requirements on a waiver.

Finally, administrators' assessments of the willingness of special and vocational education teachers not currently involved in on-site work experience training to get involved suggest that, at most, a third of them may be willing. Whether this reluctance pertains to a low opinion of the relative importance of work experiences, a lack of training emphasis in this area, or other factors is not clear.

This preliminary inquiry into administrative and personnel conditions which could influence the enhancement of work experiences points out the need to increase the emphasis on providing early work experiences and to help school administrators to overcome barriers to an increased emphasis. Lack of sufficient resources, as mentioned in the comments of several respondents, is probably an important consideration but one which is ever present. Other problems may be solvable within the framework of existing resources. Vocational education funds for handicapped youth, for instance, may need to be directed more at work experience options than at participation in traditional VocEd courses to increase students' opportunities to become involved in work as early as possible. Their involvement in work experiences and other vocational education activities must be reflected as a priority goal in IEPs before (a) teacher release time options become workable or (b) teachers become more willing to participate in on-site work experience training. If, as has been suggested in the literature (Knowlton & Clark, 1987; Brown et al., 1987), a major reorientation in teacher training for secondary special education is a requisite for change in schools to occur, then more extensive and efficient use of early work experiences may be slow in coming. However, if inservice special education teachers are encouraged to try to develop a mix of participation, academic, vocational and life skill (e.g., social skills) instruction and administrators are willing to make necessary adjustments (scheduling, transportation, etc.), then it may be possible that teachers would recognize benefits of instruction referenced to the community and handicapped youth would have earlier entry into the employment transition process. Such policy implementation measures require empirical study in which the changes are implemented and effects measured.

Several other questions pertaining to policy implementation at the school level are indicated from the results of this study. An initial question is, should special education be primarily responsible for the vocational education of mildly handicapped students with cooperation from vocational education? That seems to be the case in many of the respondent's schools. Yet, the data also suggests that vocational education has taken more responsibility in at least some districts. Mainstreaming advocates would criticize any approach that diminished opportunities for participation in mainstream vocational education classes. Still, others are questioning the viability of mainstreaming in secondary education programs (Edgar, 1987).

A second question is, should work experience training and other "non academic" transition-related instruction be the responsibility of a special education specialist? If 40% of those not now participating are willing, possibly they should be prepared as transition specialists and the rest left to carry out academic instruction. Transition specialists are split on this. Some advocate for genericists (cf. Brown et al., 1987) while others favor further specialization among secondary special educators (Knowlton & Clark, 1987: Clark, 1984).

A third question is, would an emphasis on employment training for mildly handicapped high schoolers have an exclusionary effect on those who are exiting school into post secondary education? It may be that the low involvement of mildly handicapped students in work experiences reflects a concern for preparing them for other forms of transition. Halpern and his colleagues (Halpern, 1985: Benz & Halpern, 1986; 1987) have repeatedly stressed the need to include transition service development other than just employment training.

Work experiences which are integrated into the secondary special education program are essential to the successful transition to adult life of youth with handicaps. A more concerted effort is needed to determine how that integration process may be implemented.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alley, G., & Deshler, D. (1979). *Teaching the learning disabled adolescent: Strategies and methods.* Denver: Love Publishing Co.

Anderson, L. E. (1975). Vocational blues. In D. Kronick (Ed.), *Hey, what about me? The LD adolescent* (pp. 117-128). San Rafael, CA: Academy Therapy Publications.

Benz, M., & Halpern, A. (1986). Vocational preparation for high school students with mild disabilities: A statewide study of administrator, teacher, and parent perceptions. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, *9*, 3-15.

Benz, M. R., & Halpern, A. S. (1987). Transition services for secondary students with mild disabilities: A statewide perspective. *Exceptional Children*, *53*, 507-514.

Black, T. J. (1976). Where do I go from here? The involvement of vocational rehabilitation and occupational education with the learning disabled in North Carolina. *Rehabilitation Literature*, *37*, 169-171.

Bourbeau, P. E., Sowers, J. A., & Close, D. W. (1986). An experimental analysis of generalization of banking skills from classroom to bank settings in the community. *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded*, 98-107.

Brolin, D. E. (1976). Vocational services for the retarded (4). In D. E. Brolin (Ed.), *Vocational preparation of retarded citizens*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Brown, L., Halpern, A. S., Brody-Hasazi, S., & Wehman, P. (1987). From school to adult living: A forum on issues and trends. *Exceptional Children*, *53*, 546-554.

Brown, L., Nietupski, J., & Hamre-Nietupski, S. (1976). Criterion of ultimate functioning. In M. Thomas (Ed.) *Hey, don't forget about me* (pp. 2-15). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Clark, G. M. (1984). Issues in teacher education for secondary special education: Time for hindsight and foresight. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *7*, 170-176.

Clark, G. M. (1985). A national study of high school programs for handicapped youth in transition. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (Grant No. G0085-3027).

Deshler, D. D., Schumaker, J., & Lenz, B. K. (1984). Academic and cognitive interventions for LD adolescents: Part I. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *17*, 108-117.

Edgar, E. (1985). How do special education students fare after they leave school? A response to Hasazi, Gordon, and Roe. *Exceptional Children*, *51*(6), 470-473.

Edgar, E. (1987). Secondary programs in special education: Are many of them justifiable? *Exceptional Children*, *53*, 555-561.

Fafard, M. B., & Haubrich, P. A. (1981). Vocational and social adjustment of learning disabled young adults: A follow-up study. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *4*, 122-130.

Foster, W. C. (1985). *Special education work study programs and the functions and responsibilities of special education work study coordinators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University.

Gilbert, J. F. (1973). *A survey of selected aspects of work-study programs for educable mentally retarded students attending public secondary schools in the state of Utah*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University.

Halpern, A. (1985). Transition: A look at the foundations. *Exceptional Children*, *51*(6), 479-486.

Halpern, A. S. (1973). *The impact of work study programs on employment of the mentally retarded: Some findings from two sources* (Working paper No. 61). Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Research and Training Center in Mental Retardation.

Halpern, A. S. (1973). General unemployment and vocational opportunities for EMR individuals. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, *78*(2), 123-127.

Halpern, A. S. and Benz, M. R. (1987). A statewide examination of secondary special education for students with mild disabilities: Implications for the high school curriculum. *Exceptional Children*, *54*(2), 122-129.

Harrington, T. F. (1982). *Handbook of career planning for special needs students*. Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems.

Hasazi, S. B. (1985). Facilitating transition from high school: Policies and practices. *American Rehabilitation*, *11*(3), 9-11.

Hasazi, S. B., Gordon, L. R., & Roe, C. A. (1985). Factors associated with the employment status of handicapped youth exiting high school from 1979 to 1983. *Exceptional Children*, *51*(6), 455-469.

Hasazi, S. B., Gordon, L. R., Roe, C. A., Finck, K., Hull, M., & Salembier, G. (1985). A statewide follow-up on post high school employment and residential status of students labeled "mentally retarded." *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded*, *20*(4), 222-234.

Hodell, S. (1984). *Adult adjustment of the learning disabled versus the non-handicapped five years after high school*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University.

Horiuchi, C. N. (1973). *The respective role perceptions of special education teachers and rehabilitation counselors in a cooperative work experience and study program*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado.

Horn, W. F., O'Donnell, J. P., & Vitulano, L. A. (1983). Long-term follow-up studies of learning-disabled persons. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *16*(9), 542-555.

Huene, S. A. (1979). *The influence of work study experience on educable and trainable mentally retarded students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Knowlton, H. E., & Clark, G. M. (1987). Transition issues for the 1990s. *Exceptional Children*, *53*, 562-563.

Liberty, K. A. (1985). Enhancing instruction for maintenance, generalization, and adaptation. In K. C. Lakin & R. H. Bruininks, (Eds.) *Strategies for achieving community integration of developmentally disabled adults* (pp. 29-71). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Maddox, M., & Edgar, E. (1984). *Maneuvering through the maze: Transition planning for human service agency clients*. Seattle: University of Washington, Networking and Evaluation Team.

Malouf, D. (1982). Is your school helping or hindering the career/vocational development of handicapped students? *Pointer*, *26*(4), 18-20.

Maraski, J. (1982). Designing career education programs that work. *Academic Therapy*, *18*(10), 65-71.

Marinoble, R. (1980). Community jobs for handicapped students: A career education technique. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, *29*(2).

McNutt, G., & Heller, G. (1978). Services for learning disabled adolescents: A survey. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *1*, 101-103.

Meers, G. D. (1980). *Handbook of special vocational needs education*. Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems.

Mithaug, D., & Horiuchi, C. (1983). *Colorado statewide follow-up survey of special education students.* Denver: Colorado State Department of Education.

Mithaug, D. E., Horiuchi, C. N., & Fanning, P. N. (1985). A report on the Colorado statewide follow-up survey of special education students. *Exceptional Children, 51*, 397-404.

Mock, W. L. (1974). *A comparison of graduates of work study and traditional programs designed for those formally labeled educable mentally retarded (EMR).* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Nacson, J., & Kelley, E. M. (1980). Vocational education: Meeting the needs of special populations (Contract No. 400-79-0012). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Nietupski, J., Hamre-Nietupski, S., Clancy, P., & Veerhausen, K. (1986). Guidelines making simulation an effective adjunct to in vivo community instruction. *Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped, 11*, 12-18.

Smith, T. E. (1977). *High school principals' attitudes toward the handicapped and the work study program.* Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University.

Strickland, C. G. & Arrel, Y. M. (1967). Employment of the mentally retarded. *Exceptional Children, 34*, 21-24.

Valantine, I. E., & Oshima, A. (1979). *An investigation of the vocational director's role and responsibilities in the delivery and evaluation of disadvantaged and handicapped vocational education programs as perceived by the local administrator.* Unpublished manuscript, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO.

Vetter, A. A. (1983). *A comparison of the characteristics of learning disabled and non-disabled young adults.* Unpublished manuscript, The University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Wehman, P., Hill, J. W., Wood, W., & Parent, W. (1987). A report on competitive employment histories of persons labeled severely mentally retarded. *JASH, 12*(1), 11-17.

Wehman, P., Kregal, J., & Seyfarth, J. (1985). Employment outlook for young adults with mental retardation. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 29*(2), 90-99.

White, W. J., Schumaker, J. B., Warner, M. M., Alley, G. R., & Deshler, D. D. (1981). *The current status of young adults identified as learning disabled during their school career* (Research Report No. 21). Lawrence, KS: The University of Kansas Institute for Research in Learning Disabilities.

Wilburn, G. R. (1975). _The effects of a work study program on identified probable dropouts._ Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.

Will, M. C. (1985). Opening remarks. _Journal of Adolescent Health Care_, _6_, 79-83.

Will, M. C. (1985). Statement on transition. _American Rehabilitation,_ _8_(3).